St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: Fetter Lane

NEW YORK
The Macmillan Co.
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA and MADRAS
Macmillan and Co., Ltd.
TORONTO
The Macmillan Co. of Canada, Ltd.
TOKYO
Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha

All rights reserved

St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem

BY THE REVERENT

WILFRED L. KNOX, M.A.

Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd,
Formerly Scholar of Trinity College,
Oxford

Bono Pastori
Sancto Salvatori

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
BS
2505.1
.K6
13620

CAMBRIDGE
at the University Press
MCMXXV

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

In this book I have endeavoured to put forward a narrative of the life of the Apostle of the Gentiles during that period of his career in which he was in contact with the original community of Christians in Jerusalem, who were responsible for the preservation of the record of the life and teaching of Our Lord. Such a narrative involves an examination of the nature and implications of his doctrines, and the extent to which they were already explicitly held by those who were before him in the faith or represented a new development in the Christian religion. The attempt is complicated by the vast amount of literature published in recent times both on the whole life of S. Paul and on particular aspects of his teaching. The difficulty is increased by the fact that much of this literature is the work of specialists who have pressed their own particular point of view to lengths which a fuller knowledge of other aspects of the subject would have shown to be untenable. Naturally I do not flatter myself that I have avoided the opposite danger of giving a very inadequate amount of attention to many, if not all, of the features which call for consideration. For example, I am conscious that the relation of S. Paul to the contemporary religious movements of the Hellenistic world needs fuller consideration; but until the literature and in particular the original writings available for the study of the subject are more accessible this shortcoming is hardly to be avoided.

I should be guilty of ingratitude if I did not here record the debt I owe to the late Professor Haverfield and the late Mr H. J. Cunningham of Worcester College, Oxford, to whom I owe my interest in the history of the Roman Empire and such little knowledge of it as I possess. *Requiescant in pace.*

On account of the vast extent of the modern literature on the subject I have limited my references to it to the smallest possible compass; my indebtedness to the work of Schürer, Ramsay, Charles, and others will be obvious to any reader. For my impertinence in presenting to the public a book on such a subject, which has been composed for the most part in the intervals of parochial work in London, I can only offer my humblest apologies.

WILFRED L. KNOX

THE ORATORY HOUSE,
CAMBRIDGE.
November, 1924.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION

(*a*) SOURCES ix

(*b*) CHRONOLOGY xiii

(*c*) THE *CODEX BEZAE* xiv

Chapter I

THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM 1

Appendix I. Primitive Christology 30

Appendix II. Spiritual Gifts 32

Chapter II

STEPHEN AND SAUL 39

Appendix. The High Priesthood under the Roman Government 61

Chapter III

THE FIRST EXTENSION OF THE CHURCH

§ I. PHILIP AT SAMARIA 66

§ II. THE RE-ORGANIZATION 75

Chapter IV

THE ENTRANCE OF THE GENTILES

§ I. SAUL THE CONVERT 94

Appendix I. S. Paul and Hellenistic Judaism 126

Appendix II. S. Paul and Hellenistic Religion 136

§ II. THE CONVERSION OF CORNELIUS 150

Chapter V

THE CHURCH AT ANTIOCH

§ I. THE FIRST MISSIONARIES 156

§ II. THE FAMINE PROPHECY AND THE SECOND PERSECUTION 165

§ III. THE FAMINE AND THE FIRST CONCORDAT 179

§ IV. PETER AT ANTIOCH 191

Chapter VI

PAGE

THE APPEAL TO THE WORLD

§ I. CYPRUS AND GALATIA 199
Note on the meaning of διέρχομαι 216
§ II. THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM 219
Note on the meaning of Galatia 236
§ III. THE SECOND JOURNEY 239
§ IV. THE ROMAN CHURCH 252
§ V. MACEDONIA AND ACHAEA 261

Chapter VII

THE COLLECTION FOR THE SAINTS

§ I. PREPARATIONS 284
§ II. EPHESUS 296
Note on the Acts and Ephesus 307
§ III. THE CRISIS AT CORINTH 309
§ IV. THE VICTORY AT CORINTH 328

Chapter VIII

THE END OF THE JOURNEYS

§ I. PAUL AND ROME 345
§ II. PAUL IN JERUSALEM 357
Appendix I. The Apostolate 363
Appendix II. The Primitive Eucharist 372

INDEX 386

INTRODUCTION

(*a*) SOURCES

THE primary sources for the period of the life of S. Paul during which he was in active personal contact with the Church of Jerusalem are the letters written by him to his converts in Galatia and at Thessalonica and Corinth. The authenticity and substantial integrity of these letters are not seriously disputed except in the case of 2 Thessalonians. This letter is not in itself of great historical importance; reasons are, however, given in the text for supposing that the objections commonly raised against its authenticity are ill-founded. The same applies to the arguments of some critics that the concluding chapters of Romans do not belong to that Epistle. In the case of 2 Corinthians reasons are given for regarding the Epistle in its present form as a combination of portions of two separate Pauline Epistles to the Corinthian community. Apart from these minor questions the Epistles of this group form our primary authority, being first-hand documents for the study of the life and work of their author.

Second only to these stands the book known as the Acts of the Apostles. It might seem natural to examine here the much-debated question of its origin, date and method of composition. Such a discussion would, however, be impossible at this point, since the answer to these questions depends very largely on the extent to which the book can be accepted as being in the main a reliable historical record of the events which it narrates. It is clear that the author does not profess to have been an eye-witness of more than a comparatively small portion of the career of his hero, and that for the rest of his narrative he depends on sources of some kind other than his own observation. Thus the question arises whether these sources were in themselves reliable, as he claims that the sources for his narrative of the Gospel were (assuming him to be the author of the Gospel traditionally ascribed to S. Luke). Further, it is necessary to examine the method followed by him in dealing with his information, in so far as it was not derived from his own immediate personal contact with S. Paul, if indeed those portions of the narrative which profess to be the work of an eye-witness are genuinely what they profess to be, and are the work of the final editor. In particular it is necessary to ask whether we find throughout the narrative personal peculiarities of outlook and methods of dealing with the material at the author's disposal, or whether the material has been simply pieced together without criticism or revision by the editor from whom it received its final form.

All these questions can only be answered by a very close consideration of the actual text of the Acts taken as a whole. To attempt such an examination here would simply be to anticipate the greater part of the narrative given in the text of this book and the reasons stated in the notes for believing that narrative to be correct. If those conclusions be accepted, it follows that the author in the main had access to sources of the highest authority and that he was in a position to supplement them from other sources of almost equal merit. A crucial instance of this is the section viii. 4–25. If the explanation of the narrative given in c. III. § i. n. 12 be correct, it is clear that the author had at his disposal in the first instance a simple narrative of the visit of S. Philip to Samaria and the confirmation of his work there by the two chief Apostles. This narrative also included the incident of Simon Magus. From another source the writer was aware of the fact that the whole question of the admission of Samaritans to the Church had been a matter of vigorous controversy; since, however, the subject of the controversy was in principle identical with that involved in the later controversy as to the admission of the Gentiles, he had no reason for describing it at length. Accordingly he has introduced three phrases which imply the controversy, in order to avoid the appearance of omitting it altogether, but has otherwise ignored it. A similar method of dealing with the information available will be found in his terminology in viii. 14, xi. 1 and 22 as discussed in c. III. § ii. n. 20. Numerous other instances are to be found which confirm this view. The author is regularly in the habit of covering by an allusion a whole incident or series of incidents, of which he is well aware, but which he does not for one reason or another desire to describe in full; his method of doing so is to introduce into the information at his disposal from one source phrases or sentences which reveal the possession of information drawn from a different origin. His object is in many cases to avoid, as far as possible, a full discussion of the painful controversies of the past between S. Paul and the Christians of Jerusalem. His allusions would be intelligible to those who remembered these controversies; to a later generation of uncritical readers they would be quite unintelligible; they have almost invariably been misunderstood by the compiler of the *Codex Bezae*. In general it will be manifest that if the interpretation of the evidence of the Acts put forward in this book be accepted, the Acts must be regarded as a source of the highest historical value, second only to the Pauline Epistles; but to give the grounds on which this conclusion rests

at this point would simply mean anticipating the main part of the book.

For the same reason it seems unnecessary to investigate at this point the other documentary sources for the life and times of S. Paul. For the most part I have followed the views generally held by recognized authorities; where in any case I have dissented from such views the reasons will be found in the book itself; to discuss them here would simply be to anticipate results which depend for their validity on the whole view of the facts which I have advanced. This is particularly the case with regard to the Epistle of S. James and the Epistle to the Ephesians. In the case of the former in particular the question of authenticity must depend on the question whether the Epistle is consistent with such information as we can glean from other sources as to the outlook of primitive Hebrew Christianity. In regard to the non-canonical books of the Old Testament I have in general followed the accounts of their origin and composition put forward in Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. I am conscious that in regard to the primitive literature of rabbinical Judaism my lack of first-hand knowledge is one of the numerous defects of this book; as it is, I have been compelled to make the best of the recognized modern writers on this subject. None the less this literature must always be a secondary source for the study of primitive Christianity; for it is only where we find the conceptions of rabbinical Judaism already present in pre-rabbinical literature that we can be certain that they were present in Pauline Judaism.

In one respect it is scarcely possible at present to express a decided opinion as to the origin of Pauline and early Christian ideas. The whole question of the relation of S. Paul to the Hellenistic theology in which the mystery-cults expressed and propagated themselves needs fuller investigation than it has yet received. At the same time it will be clear, from the discussion of the subject in c. IV. § i. Appendix 2, that its treatment by such writers as Reitzenstein is seriously vitiated by a failure to recognize that in several cases alleged borrowings on the part of S. Paul from Gentile literature of this character appear on closer investigation to be perfectly straightforward developments of the Old Testament. The relation of Jewish to Gentile theology in the centuries before the Christian era will need much fuller investigation before any decisive verdict can be given on the whole of this subject. Further, it will be necessary to recognize how easily resemblances of thought and language may occur to writers who are

occupied in the same task, namely the expression of religious and mystical experience in language intended to appeal to the reader who has himself little or no first-hand knowledge of that experience.

ABBREVIATIONS, ETC.

Josephus. (References to the *Editio Stereotypa*, as quoted by Schürer; these references are given in the margin of Niere's text.)

Antt. Antiquitates Judaicae.

B.J. Bellum Judaicum.

c. Apion. Contra Apionem.

Vita.

Philo. References to the Richter edition of 1828, with those of Mangey's text added in parenthesis. Unfortunately the Cohn-Wendland text was not fully available until a considerable part of this book was completed, and it seemed preferable to use the older system, rather than to revise the whole of the references to Philo in accordance with a system different from that generally used by writers on the New Testament.

The various books of Philo are referred to by the initial letters or syllables of the Latin titles of the Richter edition.

Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. References are given in accordance with Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.* (referred to as *Apocr. and Pseud.*).

Jub. The Book of Jubilees.

Ps. Arist. The "Letter of Aristeas."

1 En. The Book of Enoch.

Adam and Eve. The Books of Adam and Eve. (Where necessary the "Apocalypse of Moses" incorporated in this document is referred to as *Apoc. Moys.*)

Testt. XII Patr. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. (The particular Testaments are referred to as *Test. Reub.* etc.)

Or. Sib. The Sibylline Oracles.

Ass. Moys. The Assumption of Moses.

2 En. The Book of the Secrets of Enoch.

2 Bar. The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch.

3 Bar. The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch.

4 Esdr. The Fourth Book of Ezra.

Pss. Sol. The Psalms of Solomon.

4 Macc. The Fourth Book of Maccabees.

P.A. Pirke Aboth.

Bibl. Antt. The book commonly known as the *Biblical Antiquities*

formerly ascribed to Philo. References are given to the S.P.C.K. translation of 1917.

Tr. San. The Tractate Sanhedrin (references to the S.P.C.K. translation).

Tr. Ber. The Tractate Berakhoth (references to S.P.C.K. translation).

H.E. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius (references to Bright's edition, Oxford, 1881).

It will perhaps be convenient to note here certain abbreviations employed to designate more recent works which are quoted with some frequency.

Hor. Hebr. The *Horae Hebraicae* of John Lightfoot (references to the Oxford edition of 1859).

E.E.P. Kirsopp Lake's *Earlier Epistles of S. Paul.*

G.J.V. Schürer's *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (references to the Leipzig edition of 1901).

Dict. d'Arch. Chrét. The *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, edited by Leclercq and Cabrol, now in course of publication.

Voc. Gr. Test. Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament.*

Life and Times. Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (1887 edition).

Hastings' *D.B.* Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1910 edition).

P.R.E. Mommsen, *Provinces of the Roman Empire.*

(*b*) CHRONOLOGY

For the purpose of convenience a summary is given of the main dates in S. Paul's career during the period covered by this book. The grounds on which these dates are based are discussed in detail in the book itself.

A.D. 35–36 (*i.e.* between the autumn of 35 and the spring of 36). Death of S. Stephen and conversion of S. Paul.

A.D. 38 (spring). S. Paul returns to Jerusalem from Damascus and leaves for Tarsus.

A.D. 40. One year's ministry of SS. Paul and Barnabas at Antioch.

A.D. 41. The Herodian persecution.

A.D. 48 (spring, possibly autumn of 47). "Famine-visit" of SS. Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem.

A.D. 48 (summer)–49 (spring). First missionary journey.

A.D. 49 (summer). Epistle to the Galatians and Council of Jerusalem.

A.D. 50 (spring—autumn). Second journey (from the Syrian Antioch to Corinth).

A.D. 51 (summer). Gallio arrives in Corinth.
A.D. 52 (spring). S. Paul leaves Corinth.
A.D. 52 (autumn). S. Paul opens his mission at Ephesus.
A.D. 55 (summer). S. Paul leaves Ephesus.
A.D. 55 (autumn). S. Paul reaches Corinth.
A.D. 56 (spring). S. Paul leaves Corinth, reaching Jerusalem about Pentecost.

(*c*) THE BEZAN RECENSION OF THE ACTS

At various times the view has been put forward that in the *Codex Bezae* and its variants we have access to an original Lucan text of the Acts of which the generally received text is an abridgment made by the author himself. There is no doubt that in the main this belief is due to the fact that the Bezan text of the proceedings of the Council of Jerusalem in xv. 20 and 28 is free from the difficulty presented by the received text. It omits the reference to "things strangled" and adds a negative form of the rule of Christian conduct, "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you." The whole question of this particular passage is discussed in c. vi. § ii. n. 41, where reasons are given for supposing that the received text is probably the correct one, and that which we should naturally expect in the conditions of the time at which the Council met, in view of the necessity of regulating the common meals of the Church in such a way as not to offend Jews who still observed the Law; while the rapid failure of the Pauline attempt to combine in the Church Gentiles who did not observe the Law and Jews who continued to do so explains the early abandonment of the actual practice enjoined in the decrees of the Council. Naturally the neglect of the decrees would lead to the alteration of the text by a copyist who saw that they no longer harmonized with Christian practice. In any case the relative value of this group of MSS. must be judged not by the fact that in this case they offer us an easier reading but by the general character of the variations from the received text.

Now it is well known that in general the MSS. of this family offer us a longer text. This is in itself suspicious. There is absolutely no explanation of the motive which would lead S. Luke to compose a shorter draft of his narrative; still less of any motive which would lead him to abbreviate it by the omission of odd sentences here and there, resulting altogether in a merely trifling abbreviation of the whole. On the other hand, we are familiar with the practice of

introducing single words, phrases, and whole sentences into an existing text in order to explain points which appear ambiguous in the original or to add details which may be inferred from it, or in order to increase its value for dogmatic purposes. In such revisions we also find a tendency to omit phrases which seem superfluous or difficult, or which clash with the writer's own presuppositions. The most familiar instance of such rewriting is the treatment of S. Mark's Gospel by the other two Synoptists, although their revision is complicated by the fact that they employ not only that Gospel but other trustworthy sources as well. Although the process is familiar to students of the N.T. it is perhaps desirable to illustrate it once again. The narrative of the Transfiguration will serve as an instance in which the various motives are very clearly to be seen (Mt. xvii. 1 *seqq.*, Mk ix. 2 *seqq.*, Lk. ix. 28 *seqq.*).

Mt.

καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάνην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς. καὶ ἰδοὺ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλείας συνλαλοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ· κύριε καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι· εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἠλεία μίαν. ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα. καὶ προσῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἁψάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν· ἐγερθῆτε καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε. ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον. καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· μηδενὶ εἴ-

Mk

καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάνην καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι. καὶ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Ἠλείας σὺν Μωϋσεῖ καὶ ἦσαν συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ· ῥαββεί, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἠλείᾳ μίαν. οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ· ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο. καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ ἃ εἶδον διηγήσωνται, εἰ μὴ ὅταν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ. καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συνζητοῦντες τί ἐστιν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ-

Lk.

ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, καὶ παραλαβὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην καὶ Ἰάκωβον ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ, οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλείας, οἳ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ· ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ· διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· ἐπιστάτα, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνὰς τρεῖς, μίαν σοὶ καὶ μίαν Μωϋσεῖ καὶ μίαν Ἠλείᾳ, μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει· ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν νεφέλην. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. καὶ

Mt.	Mk	Lk.
πητε τὸ ὅραμα ἕως οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθῇ. καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες· τί οὖν οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι Ἠλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· Ἠλείας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι Ἠλείας ἤδη ἦλθεν καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν. οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν. τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάνου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.	ναι. καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἠλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Ἠλείας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα· καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενηθῇ; ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ Ἠλείας ἐλήλυθεν, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν.	ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὑρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσίγησαν καὶ οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις οὐδὲν ὧν ἑώρακαν.

The first point that strikes us when the original Marcan narrative is compared with the two later editions of it is the intensification of the miraculous element. The vivid impression of garments glittering white "as no fuller on earth could white them" has become in S. Matthew purely conventional; Our Lord's face shines like the sun and His garments are white as the light; in S. Luke they are "flashing white"; the attempt to enhance the supernatural has lost the genuine personal touch of the original. This conventionalization of the narrative meets us still more strikingly in the Marcan detail of the bewilderment of the disciples as to the meaning of Our Lord's words about the resurrection of the Son of Man from the dead. S. Mark's narrative goes back to a time when the Resurrection of Our Lord was not a thing to be assumed as a matter of course; the later narratives have forgotten that the disciples at this point did not even expect His death. In these two cases the narrative shows clear traces of expansion to harmonize it with the beliefs of the primitive Church.

We find in the same way instances both of omission and expansion to avoid difficulties in the original in the closing section of the narrative. S. Mark preserves the extremely cryptic saying of Our Lord that Elias has already appeared, and that they have done unto him whatever they would. S. Matthew boldly asserts that the disciples then understood that He was speaking of S. John the Baptist. It is no doubt true that Our Lord had this reference in mind; that the disciples understood it at the moment is perhaps more doubtful. In any case the interpretation is inserted to explain the very difficult Marcan saying, while S. Luke avoids the difficulty by omitting the whole passage. Probably it is with a similar motive that S. Matthew

omits the detail that S. Peter did not know what he was saying when he suggested the three booths; S. Matthew sees nothing strange in his desire to remain on the mountain of vision. (Note how S. Luke conventionalizes this passage by making them weighed down by sleep, a suitable frame of mind for seeing visions.)

Details added to expand the narrative and so meet the natural desire of the primitive Church to learn as much as possible about the life of Our Lord are to be found in both narratives. Thus S. Matthew alters the bare statement that the disciples suddenly looked about them into the statement that Our Lord came and touched them, saying ἐγερθῆτε καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε; S. Luke informs us that He went up into the mountain to pray, and was praying when the Transfiguration took place. (It is of interest to note that he is already so familiar with the story that he simply states that Our Lord took His disciples up into "the mountain," although we have no allusion to this mountain in the preceding narrative.) In the same way he informs us that the subject of the conversation between Our Lord and Moses and Elias was His approaching death at Jerusalem.

To these types of alteration we may add those that are due to considerations of style; thus S. Matthew changes the clumsy κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους into κατ' ἰδίαν; the Aramaic ῥαββεὶ becomes κύριε in S. Matthew and ἐπιστάτα in S. Luke. Finally we may notice changes for which it is impossible to conjecture the reason, such as the notice in S. Matthew that John was the brother of James, and S. Luke's change of six days into eight.

From the above very rough analysis of a single passage it will be clear that the expansion of an original narrative in this manner seemed at one point in the history of the Church a natural and reasonable thing to do; it remains to enquire whether the Bezan emendations are of this character. We have already seen reason to believe that it is natural to suspect that the emendation of the narrative of the Council of Jerusalem was due to the desire to harmonize it with existing practice; our suspicion will become almost a certainty if we can trace elsewhere a motive for revision similar to any of those which we have found in the case of the synoptic narratives. In point of fact we find all of them at work; we may classify the leading instances as follows:

(*a*) *Changes introduced for dogmatic reasons.* Nothing is so striking in the narrative of the Acts as the variations in the titles by which Our Lord is referred to; it can hardly be doubted that in this respect S. Luke has accurately reproduced the practice of a period which

was not interested in dogmatic accuracy as to the nature of His personality. But the *Codex Bezae*, which it will be convenient to denote here by its usual symbol, D, will have none of this, if it can be avoided. So in i. 21, iii. 13, iv. 33, viii. 16, xi. 20, xv. 11, xvi. 31, xix. 5, xxi. 13, the word Χριστός has been added to κύριος Ἰησοῦς. In ii. 38, v. 42, x. 48 κύριος is added to Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; in vii. 55 and xviii. 5 κύριος to Ἰησοῦς. These emendations do not affect the Christology of the Acts as a whole; but they show a constant tendency to improve the text by assuming a fixed Christology, which is inclined to suspect any phrase less adequate than κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. We may notice here a miscellaneous group of additions, whose manifest purpose is to harmonize the text with the orthodox Christian tradition, or to heighten the miraculous and devotional element.

i. 2. D adds (after ἐξελέξατο) καὶ ἐκέλευσε κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

i. 5. D adds that the Apostles are to receive the Holy Ghost at Pentecost.

ii. 30. D reads ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἀναστῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ καθίσαι.

ii. 47. D cannot confine the reputation of the Apostles to Jerusalem and substitutes κόσμος; further, he finds the primitive community a little lax in its organization and adds ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ to ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.

iv. 24. D adds ἐπιγνόντες τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέργειαν (for such a phrase we have no Lucan parallel).

iv. 31. D adds παντὶ τῷ θέλοντι πιστεύειν (perhaps simply an inferential expansion).

iv. 32. D adds a conventional piece of piety καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία.

v. 5. D adds παραχρῆμα before πεσών.

v. 38, 39. D adds μὴ μιάναντες τὰς χεῖρας after ἄφετε αὐτούς, and οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι· ἀπέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων after καταλῦσαι αὐτούς, with the obvious intention of intensifying the impression made by the Apostles on Gamaliel.

vi. 8. S. Stephen's miracles were wrought διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

vi. 10. D rewrites the end of this verse thus: τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ᾧ ἐλάλει διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας. Verse 11 opens μὴ δυνάμενοι οὖν ἀντοφθαλμεῖν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Here we have an obvious addition, calculated to enhance the superiority of S. Stephen over his opponents.

viii. 1. D writes διωγμὸς μέγας καὶ θλῖψις. This is typical of his method. Just as Our Lord is always described as ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, so persecution always becomes persecution and tribulation or *vice versa* (cf. xiii. 50).

viii. 24. D adds of Simon ὃς πολλὰ κλαίων οὐ διελίμπανεν. D uses the word διαλιμπάνω, S. Luke does not (cf. xvii. 13).

x. 30. D writes *ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας μέχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας ἤμην νηστεύων τὴν ἐνάτην τε προσευχόμενος*. It seems that D thought it edifying that Cornelius should be fasting as well as praying.

x. 41. D ends this verse *καὶ συνεστράφημεν μετὰ τὸ...ἐκ νεκρῶν ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα*—an obvious harmony with Acts i. 3.

xi. 2. D here invents a wholly new incident. *ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος διὰ ἱκανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησεν πορευθῆναι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ προσφωνήσας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐπιστηρίξας αὐτοὺς πολὺν λόγον ποιούμενος διὰ τῶν χωρῶν διδάσκων αὐτούς· ὃς καὶ κατήντησεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ*. It is only charitable to assume that this incoherent string of participles is in part due to the errors of copyists. In the first instance D was shocked at the abrupt change from the conversion of Cornelius to the unedifying wrangle at Jerusalem. Hence (1) S. Peter is said to have been anxious for some time to go there. (2) A conventional farewell at Caesarea is inserted. (3) We are given a conventional and improbable missionary journey between Caesarea and Jerusalem. (4) S. Peter announces his success at Caesarea with triumph. The whole passage is simply a clumsy compilation of fragments borrowed from viii. 25, xiv. 27, and similar passages. With the actual situation it is quite inconsistent. See c. IV. § ii.

xi. 17 (after *τὸν θεὸν*) *τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα ἅγιον πιστεύσασιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ*. But Cornelius had already received the Holy Ghost; D however thinks it proper that a convert should receive the Holy Ghost from an Apostle.

xi. 27. *ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις· συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν*. It is inconceivable that a meeting on this occasion should result in rejoicing (c. v. § ii. n. 6). It seems that D knew the tradition of a Lucan connection with Antioch. This tradition apparently originated from Acts xiv. 22, which seems to imply his presence at the Pisidian Antioch; from this arose a tradition, perhaps correct, of his "Antiochene" origin, which was wrongly transferred to the more famous Syrian Antioch. In the latter city S. Luke has no particular interest. Considering its actual importance as the first centre of Gentile Christianity it is remarkable how he ignores it.

xii. 23. D rewrites the ending *καὶ καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἔτι ζῶν καὶ οὕτως ἐξέψυξεν*. The detail *ἔτι ζῶν* is intended to enhance the divine judgment.

xiii. 8. (After *πίστεως*) *ἐπειδὴ ἥδιστα ἤκουεν αὐτῶν* is added to enhance the devotion of the proconsul.

xiii. 12. *ἐθαύμασεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ*, an obvious intensification.

xiii. 33. The quotation is extended to include the reference to the Gentiles.

xiii. 38. D makes two insertions: *καὶ μετάνοια ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε δικαιωθῆναι. ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται παρὰ θεῷ*. Obviously he is puzzled by the compression of language; hence for the Pauline doctrine of a righteousness which faith does and the

Law cannot convey he invents a doctrine of repentance from things from which it is impossible to be made righteous by the Law, which is meaningless.

xiii. 41. *καὶ ἐσίγησαν*, to drive home S. Paul's victory.

xiii. 43. *ἐγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*, a clumsy anticipation of *v.* 49.

xiii. 45. D inserts *ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ* before *βλασφημοῦντες* (cf. above, on viii. 1).

xiv. 4. D adds *κολλώμενοι διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.*

xiv. 10. D inserts the proper formula *σοὶ λέγω ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

xiv. 25. *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι αὐτοὺς* is added. D cannot admit that S. Paul passed through a port without preaching.

xiv. 27. D writes *ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν*, a phrase which is almost incredible from any source but this.

xv. 7. D writes *ἀνέστησεν ἐν πνεύματι Πέτρος*. Cf. also the insertion of *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι* in *v.* 29, *πληρεῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου* in *v.* 32, and *εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ* in xx. 3. Whereas S. Luke only introduces allusions to the work of the Holy Ghost for a just reason, D reduces it to a pious convention.

xvi. 4. D writes *διερχόμενοι δὲ τὰς πόλεις ἐκήρυσσον καὶ παρεδίδοσαν αὐτοῖς μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν* (note the typical insertion of the full title) *παραδιδόντες καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν ἀποστόλων.* Of course they did nothing of the kind on these private visits to the Churches: but D feels bound to introduce his conventional piety.

xvi. 40. D writes *καὶ ἰδόντες τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς διηγήσαντο ὅσα ἐποίησεν κύριος αὐτοῖς παρακαλέσαντες αὐτοὺς καὶ* (note the typical aggregation of participles). Another piece of conventional piety.

xvii. 13. D writes *καὶ ταράσσοντες τοὺς ὄχλους οὐ διελίμπανον.* The change is trivial, but this recurrence of the non-Lucan word *διαλιμπάνω* is significant.

xvii. 15. After *Ἀθηνῶν* D inserts *παρῆλθεν δὲ τὴν Θεσσαλίαν· ἐκωλύθη γὰρ εἰς αὐτοὺς κηρῦξαι τὸν λόγον.* We shall see below how D misses the whole point of the narrative of this journey; it is sufficient here to note the pious invention of a reason for his not preaching in Thessaly.

xviii. 6. D writes *πολλοῦ δὲ λόγου γινομένου καὶ γραφῶν διερμηνευομένων, ἀντιτασσομένων κ.τ.λ.* Again a monstrous aggregation of participles for the sake of a conventional narrative.

xviii. 8. D ends the verse *πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

xviii. 27. D writes *ὃς ἐπιδημήσας εἰς τὴν Ἀχαίαν πολὺ συνεβάλλετο ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.*

xix. 1. Here we have an amazing insertion. *Θέλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν βουλὴν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν.* Apparently D, having inserted at xviii. 21 the statement (probably correct) that S. Paul wished

to be in Jerusalem for a feast, and failing to see that the Church in *v.* 22 is that of Jerusalem and not the insignificant body at Caesarea has to explain why he never went to Jerusalem after all. Note the introduction of the Holy Ghost out of piety. Of course the alteration reduces the whole story to nonsense.

xix. 5. D adds (after Ἰησοῦ) *Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.*

xix. 8. D writes *ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ ἐπαρρησιάζετο.*

xx. 24. D writes *διαμαρτύρασθαι Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἕλλησιν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.*

xx. 25. *τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.*

Hitherto we have been dealing with additions intended to heighten the dogmatic or devotional value of the narrative; we may next consider explanatory expansions inserted to clear up obscurities or simply to state explicitly the obvious meaning which it implies but does not state in so many words. These expansions in general are without dogmatic or devotional purpose, though in certain cases, *e.g.* xix. 1 (see above), the two motives are combined, while in others it is hard to say exactly which category applies. In the following list only the most obvious and important cases are considered.

i. 14. D adds *καὶ τέκνοις.*

ii. 37. D adds at the end of the verse *ὑποδείξατε ἡμῖν.*

ii. 45. D adds *καθ' ἡμέραν* after *διεμέριζον αὐτά.* He has inserted the detail from the "daily ministrations" of vi. 1, omitting to notice that it makes nonsense here. The daily ministrations were conducted by the Twelve, not by the rich converts.

iii. 3, 4, 5. According to the received text S. Peter fixes his eyes (*ἀτενίζω*) on the lame man, as does S. Paul in xiv. 9. D considers this suitable for a miracle, consequently he writes that the lame man fixed his gaze (*ἀτενίσας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ*) on SS. Peter and John and asks for alms. S. Peter fixes his eyes on the lame man (*ἀτενίσας*, here correct, is changed to *ἐμβλέψας*) and says *ἀτενίσον εἰς ἡμᾶς.* D continues *ὁ δὲ ἀτενίσας αὐτοὺς καὶ προσδοκῶν τι λαβεῖν παρ' αὐτῶν εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος.*

iii. 13. D ends the verse *κρίναντος ἐκείνου καὶ ἀπολύειν αὐτὸν θέλοντος· ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἐβαρύνατε.* Here D misunderstands the sense of *κρίναντος* and states that Pilate, having judged Our Lord, wished to release Him. Note the substitution of *ἐβαρύνατε* (non-Lucan) for *ἠρνήσασθε* to avoid the repetition of the word.

iii. 17. D writes *καὶ νῦν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐπιστάμεθα ὅτι ὑμεῖς μὲν κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε τὸ πονηρόν.* Here are two regular characteristics of D. (1) Wherever possible he harmonizes the formula of address into *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί.* Instances of this are too numerous to need quotation. (2) He is fond of introducing a word to point the moral; so here *τὸ πονηρόν*, a phrase also inserted in v. 4. Cf. also v. 38 (see above), xii. 3, where after Ἰουδαίοις is added *ἡ ἐπιχείρησις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστούς*, xiv. 2, *διωγμὸν κατὰ τῶν δικαίων*, xvi. 39 (see below).

iv. 18. D writes *συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ αὐτῶν τῇ γνώμῃ φωνήσαντες αὐτούς*, to make it clear that the Sanhedrin did come to a decision. The addition is unnecessary and clumsy, since the previous verses are a summary of the discussion, not a single speech. D has tried to harmonize the narrative with v. 39.

iv. 25. In order to minimize the confused genitives D omits *τοῦ πατρός*.

v. 10. D reads *συστείλαντες ἐξήνεγκαν καὶ ἔθαψαν* to harmonize with *v.* 6.

v. 15. D explains *ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενείας ὡς εἶχεν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν.*

v. 18. *καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἷς ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια.*

v. 21. *ἐγερθέντες τὸ πρωΐ καὶ συγκαλεσάμενοι...* (*v.* 22) *οἱ δὲ παραγενόμενοι καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὴν φυλακὴν...* Note the clumsy insertion of participles and the insertion of details which add nothing to our knowledge.

v. 35. D changes *αὐτοὺς* into *τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ συνεδρίους*. There is no N.T. parallel for the last word.

vi. 1. D adds at the end *ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῶν Ἑβραίων.*

vi. 3. *τί οὖν ἐστιν, ἀδελφοί; ἐπισκέψασθε ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν.*

vii. 4. D adds at the end of the verse *καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν.*

vii. 21. D adds (after *αὐτοῦ*) *παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν.*

vii. 24. D adds *ἐκ τοῦ γένους* after *ἀδικούμενον* and ends the verse *καὶ ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἄμμῳ.* Note the obvious insertions to suit the O.T.

vii. 26. Moses says *τί ποιεῖτε, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί; ἵνα τί....*

vii. 37. After *ὡς ἐμὲ* is added *αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε.*

viii. 1. After *ἀποστόλων* is added *οἳ ἔμειναν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ*—a typically unnecessary explanation.

x. 25. A long and quite unnecessary explanation is given here, intended to make the story more interesting. *προσεγγίζοντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰς τὴν Καισαρείαν προσδραμὼν εἷς τῶν δούλων διεσάφησεν παραγεγονέναι αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἐκπηδήσας καί.* This is characteristic of D at his best. No new information of any value is given; the details are probable in themselves, but not worth recording.

xi. 25, 26. *ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Σαῦλός ἐστιν εἰς Θάρσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀναζητῶν αὐτὸν καὶ ὡς συντυχὼν παρεκάλεσεν ἐλθεῖν.*

xii. 10. *κατέβησαν τοὺς ἑπτὰ βαθμοὺς καί.* This is a curious addition. D is hardly bold enough to insert such a detail unless he knew it to be correct. If it be correct, it seems to indicate that he possessed a knowledge of Jerusalem as it was before its destruction by Titus. Many Jewish Christians would be alive before A.D. 100 who possessed this knowledge; very few would survive after A.D. 120. Thus it would seem that D can claim a very high antiquity.

xii. 22. *καταλλαγέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Τυρίοις.*

xiii. 27. The obvious difficulty of this passage leads D to rewrite it. *οἱ γὰρ ... ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν μὴ συνιέντες γραφὰς τῶν προφητῶν τάς ... ἀναγινωσκομένας κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν καὶ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου εὑρόντες ἐν αὐτῷ κρίναντες αὐτὸν παρέδωκαν Πειλάτῳ ἵνα εἰς ἀναί-*

ρεσιν. ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν ... γεγραμμένα [*εἰσιν* an error of transmission] *ᾐτοῦντο τὸν Πειλᾶτον τοῦτον μὲν σταυρῶσαι καὶ ἐπιτυχόντες πάλιν καὶ καθελόντες.* All that need be said of this is that it makes confusion worse confounded.

xiii. 44. D writes *ἀκοῦσαι Παύλου πολύν τε λόγον ποιησαμένου περὶ τοῦ κυρίου.*

xiv. 2. *οἱ δὲ ἀρχισυναγωγοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐπήγαγον αὐτοῖς διωγμὸν κατὰ τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἐκάκωσαν... ἀδελφῶν ... ὁ δὲ κύριος ἔδωκεν ταχὺ εἰρήνην.* It is only charitable to suppose that the double mention of the *ἀρχισυναγωγοί* is a copyist's error. For *τῶν δικαίων* cf. above on iii. 17 (note that it is only in D that such a phrase is used of the Christians). The last clause is due to D's inability to grasp S. Luke's meaning, which is that the Apostles continue their mission for a considerable time in the face of opposition. D supposes that the original opposition came to an end and then broke out afresh.

xiv. 7. *καὶ ἐκινήθη ὅλον τὸ πλῆθος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ· ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας διέτριβον ἐν Λύστροις.* The first clause is merely an expansion. The latter is meant to explain the fact that they are still in Lystra although Derbe has been mentioned. For the proper explanation cf. c. VI. § i. n. 32.

xiv. 19. *διατριβόντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ διδασκόντων,* an addition similar to the foregoing.

xv. It is in this chapter that D has found the fullest scope for his imagination. In the opening section, *vv.* 1–5, we have, if the section is properly interpreted, a perfectly plain narrative, except for the lack of a subject to *ἔταξαν* in *v.* 2. The narrative is, however, a hopeless confusion unless we grasp the fact that the demands of the Pharisees in *v.* 5 are different from those of the judaizers in *v.* 1. D sees the confusion, since he fails to realize the difference between the Pharisees and the ordinary Hebrew converts. Consequently he has resort to drastic measures. In *v.* 1 the demand of the Hebrews is amplified into *περιτμηθῆτε καὶ τῷ ἔθει Μωϋσέως περιπατῆτε* in order to suit *v.* 5. Verse 2 is enlarged to avoid the difficulty of *ἔταξαν* by the addition of two new clauses, *ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος μένειν οὕτως καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν διϊσχυριζόμενος· οἱ δὲ ἐληλυθότες ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ παρήγγειλαν αὐτοῖς τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ καί τισιν ἄλλοις ἀναβαίνειν,* while at the end is added a new clause, *ὅπως κριθῶσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.* (We may note in passing that this last addition is sufficient by itself to discredit D; there is no imaginable possibility that S. Paul would have consented to be judged on the matter at Jerusalem.) Having failed to realize the peculiar position of the Pharisees D proceeds to harmonize their demands with those of the Hebrews of *v.* 1 by adding before *ἐξανέστησαν* in *v.* 5 *οἱ δὲ παραγγείλαντες αὐτοῖς ἀναβαίνειν πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἐξανέστησαν λέγοντές τινες ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες.* The clumsiness of his interpolation needs no comment; nor is it necessary to point out that we are now committed to the ludicrous view that SS. Paul and Barnabas, having

gone up to Jerusalem to be judged about the admission of the Gentiles to the Church without circumcision, are received at Jerusalem as if the matter had never been raised at Antioch, until the Pharisees, who had caused the trouble in the latter city, raise it afresh.

We may further note in *v.* 12 the insertion *συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰρημένοις*; it would be difficult to decide whether this is merely a pointless attempt to enlarge our information or whether it is intended to enhance the position of S. Peter. The former explanation is the more probable, since in general D shows no particular interest in S. Peter.

The alteration of the decision of the Council needs no further discussion here. At *v.* 34, however, we have one of those interpolations which D is fond of making, which has a disastrous result. He notices the difficulty involved in the fact that at *v.* 40 Silas joins S. Paul, although in *v.* 33 he returns with Judas to Jerusalem, while no mention is made of a journey by S. Paul to Jerusalem to fetch him. So he states *ἔδοξεν δὲ τῷ Σίλᾳ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ*. It need hardly be pointed out that had his account been true, it would have been easy for S. Luke to say that Judas went alone in the first instance. There was never a more obvious instance of a clumsy interpolation. In point of fact this alteration misses a point of crucial historical importance (cf. c. VI. § iii. n. 4).

xv. 41 shows another explanatory addition at the end, *παραδιδοὺς τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*. In point of fact it seems probable that Syria and Cilicia were easily accessible from Antioch at any time of the year; there was no reason for them to wait until S. Paul was ready for his second journey. Even if the decrees were not delivered until S. Paul's visit, it would be playing into the hands of S. Paul's opponents for S. Luke to mention the matter. But D fails to appreciate the point and inserts this clause in order to harmonize this verse with xvi. 4, where the statement is appropriate, for Derbe and Lystra lying beyond the Taurus were inaccessible in winter.

xvi. 10. Here we have an explanatory addition of the usual type, *διεγερθεὶς οὖν διηγήσατο τὸ ὅραμα ἡμῖν καὶ ἐνοήσαμεν ὅτι*.

xvi. 12. S. Luke's local patriotism has led him into a very doubtful statement that Philippi was the first city of its district of Macedonia. D goes one better and calls it the *κεφαλή*, leaving S. Luke's words *πόλις κολωνία* at the end with no sort of meaning for the word *πόλις*.

xvi. 30 shows an amusing insertion. The reader cannot fail to be struck by the carelessness of the gaoler in leaving the prison open while he visits the Apostles; so D inserts *τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφαλισάμενος*.

xvi. 35. D rubs in the humiliation of the magistrates with a series of insertions.

35. *ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης συνῆλθον οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καὶ ἀναμνησθέντες τὸν σεισμὸν τὸν γεγονότα ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν*. This is, of course, mainly "padding" inferred from the Lucan text.

39. *καὶ παραγενόμενοι μετὰ φίλων πολλῶν εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς ἐξελθεῖν λέγοντες· ἠγνοήσαμεν τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς ὅτι ἐστε ἄνδρες δίκαιοι* (for this cf. above on iii. 17). *καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς εἰπόντες* (note the amazing clumsiness of the repetition)· *ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης ἐξέλθατε μή ποτε πάλιν συστραφῶσιν ἡμῖν ἐπικράζοντες καθ' ὑμῶν.*

xvii. 12. D adds at the end of the verse the unnecessary remark *τινὲς δὲ ἠπίστησαν.*

xvii. 13. D adds at the end *οὐ διελίμπανον.* This is a favourite word of his, but not of S. Luke's.

xvii. 27. D writes *μάλιστα ζητεῖν τὸ θεῖον*, adapting the rest of the verse to suit the change of genders. *τὸ θεῖον* is, of course, unparalleled in S. Luke.

xvii. 28. D inserts (after *ἐσμεν*) *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*, another favourite phrase.

xviii. 4. D alters to *εἰσπορευόμενος δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον διελέγετο καὶ ἐντιθεὶς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἔπειθεν οὐ μόνον Ἰουδαίους ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἕλληνας.* Here D has actually preserved the sense of the original, since his revision suggests the caution of S. Paul's opening mission.

xviii. 12. D adds *κατεπέστησαν συλλαλήσαντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας*—an entirely unnecessary explanation.

xviii. 21. *εἰπὼν δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· πάλιν δὲ.* Here D is probably correct as to his inference, but it is merely an attempt to harmonize this passage with the last journey. As evidence the value of the insertion is *nil.*

xviii. 27. D thinks a long insertion necessary to explain Apollos' motives for visiting Corinth. *ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπιδημοῦντές τινες Κορίνθιοι καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ παρεκάλουν διελθεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν· συγκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ οἱ Ἐφέσιοι ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐν Κορίνθῳ μαθηταῖς ὅπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα.*

xix. 13. D here finds a very obscure and confused text and tries to improve it. His version runs: *ἐν οἷς καὶ υἱοὶ Σκευᾶ τινὸς ἱέρεως ἠθέλησαν τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι· ἔθος εἶχαν τοὺς τοιούτους ἐξορκίζειν· καὶ εἰσελθόντες πρὸς τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον ἤρξαντο ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα λέγοντες· παραγγέλλομέν σοι ἐν Ἰησοῦ ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει ἐξελθεῖν.* It is obvious here that we have not an original text but a clumsy attempt to improve a hopeless confusion.

xix. 25. Note the characteristic change of *ἄνδρες* into *ἄνδρες συντεχνῖται.*

xix. 28. After *θυμοῦ* is added *δραμόντες εἰς τὸ ἄμφοδον.* Here the inserted participle is excessively clumsy. *ἄμφοδον* is non-Lucan.

xx. 3. Here the original is compressed though not really obscure, but D thinks an explanation needed. Hence he writes (after *Ἰουδαίων*) *ἠθέλησεν ἀναχθῆναι εἰς τὴν Συρίαν· εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ ὑποστρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας· μέλλοντος οὖν ἐξιέναι αὐτοῦ μέχρι τῆς Ἀσίας συνείπετο.* Here we have a good instance of D's lack of intelligence. S. Paul's journey to Jerusalem is ascribed to a plot of the Jews,

whereas it was in fact necessitated by the circumstances. The journey through Macedonia (due in fact to the plot to murder him at sea) is then ascribed to the Spirit (cf. above on xv. 7).

xx. 15. D inserts *καὶ μείναντες ἐν Τρωγυλίῳ* after *Σάμον*. Possibly this was the natural stopping place; if so, it is of interest to note that D had some local knowledge of coasting voyages in Asia Minor.

xxi. 15. The text of D is defective here, but derivative texts show that it attempted to solve the difficulty of the original. Thus in *v.* 15 *ἐπισκευασάμενοι* becomes *ἀποταξάμενοι*, which is purely conventional. The following verses run *ἀνεβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπὸ Καισαρίας σὺν ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν· οὗτοι δὲ ἤγαγον ἡμᾶς παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν. καὶ παραγενόμενοι εἴς τινα κώμην ἐγενόμεθα παρὰ Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ. κἀκεῖθεν ἐξιόντες ἤλθομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.* Certain writers regard the fact that in this text D knows that it is a two-days' journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem as a proof of local knowledge. It is probably only an inference from the text.

We may now summarize the results of our investigations into these alterations of the text of the Acts. It is certain from the fact that they are quoted by very early patristic writers, notably Irenaeus and Tertullian, in reference to the Council of Jerusalem, that it is a copy of a very ancient and widely current text, but as has been noticed the very fact that it avoids the difficulty of the received text exposes it to the gravest suspicion. Nor can any really plausible reason be given for the production by S. Luke of two texts of the Acts. It is usually supposed that the text of D is the longer original version, and the received text an abbreviation of it drawn up by S. Luke for the benefit of some particular community. To this, which is obviously of a purely *a priori* character, it must be objected that no writer could be expected to be at the labour of revising his work by the laborious method of omitting or abbreviating single sentences scattered up and down the whole book, if he could do it by the simpler method of omitting whole sections; and the narrative of the Acts contains several sections which are entirely otiose and could easily be omitted if greater brevity were desired. Obviously it would be simple to replace the passage xi. 1–17 by a couple of sentences or to omit the accounts of S. Paul's conversion in the narratives of his arrest and trial in the later chapters of the book. By cutting out these entirely otiose repetitions he could gain far more space than by omitting odd sentences.

The final test must be, however, the character of the variations themselves. It will be seen from an examination of the passages quoted above that they are in a large number of instances determined by a desire to enhance the dogmatic or devotional value of the text

or to suggest a general level of doctrinal orthodoxy. In other cases they are explanations of obscure passages or apparent inconsistencies; and in many of these cases they succeed in obscuring completely the sense of the original narrative. In other cases they are intended to increase our knowledge by the insertion of new details, which as a matter of fact could be inferred from the text by any intelligent reader, or else are based on a desire to make the details of one part of the narrative similar to those of another.

In other words D is a revision of the Acts precisely similar to the revision of S. Mark's Gospel as found in S. Matthew and S. Luke, except for the fact that D had not at his disposal other valuable sources of information, such as that known as Q in the case of the Gospels, and was hampered by his own quite unique stupidity. This view is confirmed by his frequent use of non-Lucan words noted above and by his frequent failure to harmonize the grammar of the original with his interpolations. In the case of the few interpolations supposed to imply local knowledge we have no proof that he possessed anything more than that knowledge of Palestine and the coast of Asia which might be possessed by any Jew of the Dispersion who had travelled from Greece, Asia Minor or Macedonia to Jerusalem; and there must have been many thousands of Jewish Christians who fell within this category during the period A.D. 50–100. It would indeed be a matter of great interest if we could identify him with any degree of certainty as falling in this class, but it is highly doubtful whether the details are precise enough to justify such a view.

The real interest of D lies in the fact that it reveals to us a period in which the Church was sufficiently interested in the books of the New Testament to transcribe them, but at the same time felt perfectly free to alter and expand them. In other words they are regarded as interesting but not as inspired texts. Fortunately the period was a very brief one, and consequently these documents have not been rendered worthless by attempted improvements which obscure the true text. A few more editors of D's calibre would have rendered the Acts utterly worthless as an account of Christian origins. Incidentally it is of interest to note that the whole situation of affairs which S. Luke writes for has vanished at the time when he was edited by D; for it is precisely his somewhat obscure allusions to that situation that D is most fond of improving.

CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM

At the close of the year 35 A.D.[1] the Christian community in Jerusalem, at that date the only organized body of disciples of Jesus of Nazareth[2], was enjoying an immunity from persecution which had lasted for several years. The martyrdom of the Founder of the new sect had been rendered possible by a temporary and unnatural alliance between the Pharisees and the sacerdotal party[3]; but the former had refused to continue the policy of persecution after His removal. The reason for the change in their attitude was the fact that His successors showed no tendency to continue that insistence on the radical opposition between the spirit of the new movement and their own devotion to the most scrupulous observance of the minutest details of the letter of Jewish tradition, which had been characteristic of the teaching of the prophet of Nazareth[4]: and it was therefore natural that they should revert to the policy of tolerance which was traditional in their party[5]. It was even to their interest to pursue a policy of patronizing benevolence towards the comparatively small body of "Nazarenes." They shared the Pharisaic belief in the Resurrection of the dead, and the coming of the Messianic kingdom in a spiritual rather than a purely temporal sense[6]. Further their ethical teaching as derived from Jesus Himself closely resembled, and was to a large extent modelled on, that of the greatest Pharisaic teachers[7]. They included in their number at least one or two persons who were actually themselves Pharisees in their devotion to the Jewish system as well as Christians; and it was not to be expected that the Pharisees would tolerate a persecution which might involve the surrender of their brethren to the hatred of the Sadducean faction[8]. Thus, although the identification of the crucified dreamer of Nazareth with the Messiah might appear ridiculous in the eyes of the learned, yet there was nothing in it to call for persecution; while the distinctive religious practices of the new sect contained nothing which could be regarded as blasphemy or idolatry. As soon as the first outbreak of enthusiasm, which followed the public proclamation of the Resurrection of Jesus on the Pentecost after the Crucifixion, had shown that the successors of Jesus were harmless devotees and not dangerous fanatics, clamouring for vengeance for the blood of their Master[9], and leading their followers into dangerous adventures for the deliverance of Israel, the Pharisees had no motive for persecution and many for toleration[10]. If their beliefs were wrong, in so far as they differed from those of Pharisaism, it was best to leave

them to die out under the influence of time and disappointed hope. Meanwhile their devotion must commend them to the religious sympathies of the Pharisees; even from a political point of view it was obvious that the new movement furnished a counter-attraction to the dangerous lures of nationalist agitators. And it was always possible that their teaching was of God. In any case it was best left alone.

To this attitude, advocated in the Sanhedrin by Gamaliel, the Pharisaic leader, the adherents of the Sadducean party, the immediate personal friends and relatives of the High Priest Joseph Caiaphas, had no alternative to offer[11]. Their opponents carried too much weight with the nation to make an independent policy possible[12]. They had every reason for disliking the new movement, which by its other-worldly piety discredited their own laxity and worldliness[13]. Its insistence on the virtue of poverty was liable to express itself in language calculated to increase the unrest of the time[14]; while its very existence was a silent condemnation of the ruling class which had been legally responsible for the judicial murder of Jesus. None the less so long as there was no open demand for vengeance, and so long as the new sect did not openly proclaim its hostility to the whole system of Temple-management on which the revenues of the chiefs of the priestly class depended, there was no urgent necessity for action[15]. Nor was it easy to devise an effective method of persecution. Even with the aid of the Pharisees the task was difficult; for no death-sentence could be inflicted without the authority of the Roman procurator. Pontius Pilate would certainly not consent to such sentences on purely religious grounds; his contemptuous dislike of the nation which he had been sent to rule was more likely to lead him to welcome any movement which offended their religious susceptibilities[16]. Even the combination of circumstances which had enabled the Sanhedrin to secure the Crucifixion of Jesus had almost failed to extort his consent; and in the absence of any danger of a Passover-riot[17] and of a prisoner who could be speciously charged with stirring up political disaffection[18], it was certain that he would refuse to listen to any charge which the Sanhedrin might bring. And so long as the Pharisees in that body refused to agree to persecution, it was impossible to contemplate any appeal to the procurator or to carry on any minor form of legal persecution[19]. On the other hand the position of the Jewish government was too weak to allow them to make use of illegal methods. An appeal to violence could only lead to the withdrawal of the support of the Imperial authorities,

which alone enabled the High Priest to maintain his own position and the peace and prosperity of the Jewish nation. At the same time it would involve him in complicity with the Jewish factions, already numerous, which advocated open rebellion against the Gentile oppressor. At present it was necessary to make every effort to maintain that harmony with the Imperial government which enabled the priestly rulers of the nation both to protect the people from the excesses of Roman officials and to keep in check the popular movements in favour of open rebellion. Illegal persecution of the Christian community could only result in an alliance of the High Priest and his followers with the extremists and a war with Rome, in which the wealth and position of the Sadducean rulers would be irretrievably lost[20].

The Christian body was thus enabled for several years to enjoy comparative security, and to make a steady increase in numbers[21]. It possessed a double character, since it was for the present both a religious sect and a social organization. In its former character it was a sect of Judaism. Its members accepted alike the obligations of the Law and the worship of the Temple[22], but added to these certain specific doctrines and practices. In doctrine they were distinguished from the rest of the nation by the belief that Jesus of Nazareth was in fact the Messiah, the Righteous Servant of God appointed to suffer for the redemption of Israel, that He had risen from the dead after His Crucifixion[23], and that He would shortly return to establish a kingdom in which all who had believed in Him would be rewarded by deliverance from the punishment that awaited the wicked and admission to a state of everlasting happiness. The exact form of the Messianic kingdom was vaguely conceived. The sayings of Jesus had much in common with the current apocalyptic literature of the time, and they were naturally amplified by His followers with elements borrowed from such writings or the ideas of the circles from which they emanated[24]. It was however certain that admission to the eternal happiness of the kingdom could only be obtained by repentance from past sin and belief in Jesus as the risen Saviour and future judge of all mankind. Those who satisfied these conditions were admitted to the new society by a ceremonial baptism in which the recipient was delivered from the sins of the past and enabled to receive that salvation which was the portion of the believer[25]. How far that salvation consisted in the present deliverance from sin, and how far in the prospect of the eternal reward of the coming Messianic kingdom, was not, in view of the assumed imminence of the kingdom,

a matter of immediate interest[26]. The death and Resurrection of the Saviour were further commemorated in the solemn rite of the "breaking of bread" instituted by the Master Himself on the night of His Passion, and preserved as a continual memorial of His death, and a means whereby the benefits of His triumph over it were conveyed to all His faithful followers[27].

This rite was however closely associated with the social organization of the Christian body. Its members accepted in the most literal sense the ethical principles laid down by their Founder. All possessors of any considerable amount of property were expected to sell it for the benefit of the whole community; and from the proceeds of such sales and the labour of the able-bodied members of the community, provision was made in the shape of a common daily meal for the needs of all, including those who were unable to support themselves[28]. The daily meal was however a religious rite as well. It naturally recalled to mind the common life which the first disciples had shared with the Lord before His death, and particularly the climax of that life, the supper on the eve of His Crucifixion. Consequently it culminated in a repetition of the rite which He had on that occasion instituted as the specific observance which was to distinguish His followers from the rest of the world. This rite, known as the "breaking of bread," gave both a name and a special character to the daily meal, since each day brought with it a re-enactment of the closing scene of the ministry of the Master, and emphasized the unity of all members of the Christian body both with one another and with the Lord Whose return they awaited[29].

For its appeal to the general public the new movement did not simply depend on the witness of its leaders to the fact of the Resurrection of Jesus, and their capacities to lead their hearers to a sense of sin and the need of redemption as a means of sharing in the Messianic kingdom. They were able to enforce their words by signs and wonders, ascribed directly to supernatural intervention. Such signs were indeed necessarily expected of those who claimed to exercise a divine commission, and without them the claims of the followers of Jesus would have fallen on deaf ears[30]. Of such signs the most impressive were naturally those which took the form of the miraculous healing of diseases; for such signs marked the ministry of the disciples of Jesus no less than they had marked that of their Master. Almost equally impressive was the power of speaking under the influence of a state of ecstasy which was attributed to the direct inspiration of the Spirit of God. This power was manifested first on

the day of Pentecost, following the Crucifixion, with the result of an immediate accession of a large number of new converts to the Christian society[31], and continued to mark the meetings of the new body. The words spoken by the person thus inspired were not in general intelligible to the speaker or to his hearers, and often the speaker could not, when the ecstasy had passed, give any coherent account of his experiences while under the influence of the Spirit. None the less the phenomenon impressed those present with a sense of divine power present in the speaker, even where no intelligible account of his utterances was possible. In certain cases however the speaker could, when the ecstasy had passed, give a coherent account of visions seen or mysteries revealed to him. In other cases he uttered intelligible messages to those present. The differences in the manifestation were naturally due to the temperament of the speaker and the extent to which he was controlled by some power external to his normal consciousness during the time of utterance[32]. In cases where the speaker retained his normal consciousness and delivered his message in normal language, though appearing to be inspired by an external spiritual force, his utterances were regarded not as "speaking with tongues," but as prophecy. Such messages naturally were couched very largely in the language of the prophets of the Old Testament, and their successors and imitators, the apocalyptic writers of the Judaism of the time. Their utterances took the form of solemn warnings of the imminence of the day of the Lord, and the consequent necessity of repentance and holiness.

These phenomena were all recognized accompaniments of the past history of Judaism, though at the time when Christianity first appeared as a definite sect within the Jewish nation they were largely discredited. The ancient revelations to the prophets were regarded as having come to an end, and such abnormal phenomena were mostly confined to the more eccentric sects of Judaism and to the Messianic impostors who found them a valuable means for stirring up the fanaticism of the ignorant. Naturally they were of equal value to the preachers of Christianity in their utterance of a message which was essentially apocalyptic, even though it refused to put forward any scheme for the political deliverance of Israel or to ally itself with the schemes of others. Although they were not as a rule employed for the purpose of impressing the general public, yet they were of the utmost value as a means of fostering and stimulating the loyalty of the faithful and in convincing the serious inquirer that the new movement, in spite of the ignorance and obscurity of its leaders, had

in fact the authority of God for the claim which it made to be the true fulfilment of the hopes and history of Israel.

These leaders were in the first place the eleven survivors of the band of twelve chosen by Jesus of Nazareth as his immediate personal followers. Their number was made up to twelve by the inclusion of Matthias, one of the persons who had known Jesus in the flesh, and seen Him after His Resurrection. Of these twelve the recognized chiefs were Peter and John, two of the three disciples who had been most intimately associated with Him during His earthly life. Their authority rested on the pre-eminence given to them by Him, Peter being clearly the leader of the two[33]. The general pre-eminence of the Twelve was undisputed, and was confirmed both by the vigour and confidence of their preaching, and by its visible success in producing the healing of diseases. The exact nature of their authority was entirely undefined; and in the absence of any opposition or question it was natural that it should be so. To the outer world they represented a new school of thought in Judaism, and, as the recognized teachers and leaders of it, they were able, apart from the early and ineffective attempts at suppression, to conduct a regular mission in its favour, which had its centre in the portion of the Temple known as "Solomon's Porch." Within the community their functions included the charge of the common funds and the supervision of the common meals, which needed as their president one who possessed the spiritual authority which gave him the right to celebrate the solemn eucharistic mystery of the "breaking of bread[34]." They also conducted the public prayers and instructions of the Church, and regulated its spiritual exercises, and held the authority to decide as to the admission of new members, and the punishment of offenders against the society[35].

Below them stood a body of believers who, although they held no definite position of authority, were none the less marked out as possessing certain claims to eminence over the rest of the community. The main element in this body consisted of those who had seen the Lord both before and after His Resurrection, notably those who had been present at one of the appearances of the Risen Lord, at which He had commanded His followers to preach the message of His kingdom to the world at large[36]. To these were added some, who, though not actually witnesses of the Resurrection, were none the less in virtue of their personal character or their benefactions to the Church recognized as standing out above the rank and file of the Christian society, and possessing a special claim to be heard in all deliberations as to the actions of the whole body[37].

For the present the community did not extend beyond Jerusalem and the suburban villages[38]. In Galilee and even further afield there were isolated followers of "the Way," but they formed as yet no definitely organized societies[39]. Such followers were distinguished from their fellow-Jews by their belief that Jesus had risen from the grave and that He would shortly return in glory to judge both the quick and the dead[40]; but their worship was that of the synagogue, and they had no means of following the distinctive forms of Christian worship and social organization.

The new sect consisted exclusively of those who were Jews by religion, though it numbered among its members some who had entered Judaism as proselytes and not by birth. There was no doubt of the binding character of the Mosaic Law, nor of the claim to veneration of those who not only observed the Law, but also safeguarded their observance with a scrupulous adherence to the scribal traditions with which several generations of Pharisaism had fenced about the letter of the Mosaic code. The Pharisees within the Church were indeed a small minority distinguished for their Jewish piety, as they were among the nation as a whole[41]. But there was no question that the general observance of the Law was binding, and many of the sayings of Jesus could be quoted in support of this view[42].

On the other hand the counsels of perfection laid down by the Master were followed with an almost literal exactness. In matters of property the rich were expected to surrender their goods for the benefit of the whole community, which was bound to support the helpless[43]. The produce of the labours of all members alike passed to the common store of the Church. Besides avarice, such sins as swearing, anger, quarrelling and respect for worldly position were regarded with the sternest reprobation[44]. The continued expectation of the immediate return of the Lord, and the constant manifestation in external phenomena of the presence of the Spirit of God naturally fostered the constant endeavour to attain to Christian perfection.

In spite however of the harmony of the Christian body, it contained within itself three elements, which though equally recognizing the obligation of observing the Jewish Law were none the less inclined both by training and tradition to take widely different views both as to its exact scope and its claim to be permanently binding on the followers of Jesus. There were in the first place the Pharisee converts, for whom the Law was not merely the pledge of the covenant between God and His people, but the guarantee of their future glory both in this world and the next, provided that it was faithfully kept.

The Law was to the Pharisee the revelation of the nature of God Himself; for the Holy One Himself observed the Law, which He had given to Israel, and indeed to all mankind, as the greatest of all His blessings. To observe the Law in its minutest detail, and to extend its sphere over every department of human life was the pride and delight of the Pharisee; and although the more extravagant glorifications of the Law as the revelation of God could hardly survive the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah by the Christian Pharisee, yet he could not hesitate to continue the closest observance of the Mosaic system as interpreted by the great teachers of the age. Jesus Himself had indeed steadily refused to countenance the whole system of Pharisaism, and had reserved for it His fiercest denunciations: but it might be held that His condemnations extended rather to the false spirit which had animated the more recent developments of the system than to its actual attempt to multiply the occasions on which it was possible for man to observe the Law. Thus the Christian Pharisee, while recognizing the paramount importance of the virtues which the Law was intended to inculcate as against the details of outward observance—and in theory the Pharisees had always recognized this—might none the less hold that the obligation, or at least the desirability of adhering to the traditions of the Fathers remained intact. In the circumstances of the time it was inevitable that the Jewish Christians in general should regard such converts with the utmost respect and veneration. This was particularly the case in Jerusalem, where public opinion was steadily in favour of the Pharisees[45], in spite of the fact that many of the residents in the Holy City, no less than the cultivators and fishermen of Galilee, were inclined to resent the constant attempt of their religious leaders to add to the burden of the Law and had welcomed with enthusiasm the refusal of Jesus to accept their doctrines and practices[46].

As against the Pharisee converts the predominant element in the Church represented the popular standard of Judaism as observed by the people of the country. The Christians of this class were proud of their fidelity to the Law and careful in their observance of it, but at the same time they did not recognize in ordinary practice the newer developments of scribal tradition. They included the original Galileans who had followed Jesus and had welcomed His revolt against the growing pretensions of the Pharisees. For the most part those who could claim to have seen the Lord in the flesh were men of this type. In the eyes of the Pharisees their observance of the Law might seem perilously lax; but, although they might be contemptuously described

as "the people who knew not the Law," yet so long as they did not openly fall away from it, they had to be recognized as being within the pale of the covenant[47].

Finally there was an element which consisted of Jews and proselytes of the Dispersion, who out of devotion to their faith had left their homes to live in the centre of the one true religion[48]. They were naturally zealous for the Law by which alone they had been preserved from falling into the hideous vices of the heathen world, vices which the Jewish writers of the age were never weary of painting in the most lurid colours[49]. Their zeal could only be intensified by their personal familiarity with the moral standard of ordinary Gentile society, and by the fact that in some of their brethren that familiarity had resulted either in apostasy or a grave neglect of even the weightiest matters of the Law[50].

None the less their zeal differed profoundly from that of the native Hebrew. To the latter the faith of the Old Testament was the covenant by which God had pledged Himself at some future date to reward the sufferings of His Chosen People with a glorious triumph over the oppressor. The crimes of the latter were to be punished with eternal torments or at best with a perpetual subjection to the Jewish nation[51]. The Law was alike the standing guarantee of that triumph, and also the means by which it was to be obtained, since if only the Law could be thoroughly kept by the people the time of vengeance on the heathen would be fulfilled[52]. To the "Hellenist," as Jews born outside the promised land were called, the Law was essentially different. It was the divinely appointed means for preserving him from the abominations of heathendom. But its value lay not in the external observance of its minute ritual prescriptions, but in the spiritual lessons which such regulations inculcated[53]. The letter must indeed be observed; but such observance was only of value as a constant reminder of the necessity of striving after righteousness. Indeed it was tenable that the duty of outward observance was only necessary as an example to the weaker brethren, binding on man in his present state, but not possessing any permanent value of its own[54]. More generally however the Law was regarded as the means by which the nation was enabled to attain to a knowledge of the truth and a level of righteousness which far exceeded the highest ideals of Gentile philosophers and law-givers[55]. In a coming Messianic age it was indeed possible that a new Law would be given, as some of the prophets had foretold[56]. Until then the old Law was the only means of attaining to righteousness, not only for the Jews but also for the

Gentiles. The latter were from this point of view to be regarded not so much as hated oppressors, to be trodden underfoot in the day of divine vengeance, but fellow-men, who might yet be saved from the iniquity of the world in general, and brought to share in the eternal reward of God's faithful servants[57]. For this purpose no effort was spared both to convince them of the essential reasonableness of the Jewish system, and also to win their personal allegiance to it. To secure their general adherence to the Law of righteousness—and naturally to some extent for the lower object of securing the support of wealthy and influential Gentiles—wide concessions might be made in matters of minor observances[58].

The hope of the conversion of the Gentile world had inspired the greatest of the old prophets, and it accorded with the best beliefs of the Hebrews themselves. But oppression and the fanatical hatred evoked by oppression had hardened the views of the Hebrew against the rest of mankind. The Hellenist however, though he had left his home in order to return to the land of his fathers, was still zealous for the conversion of the Gentile. Consequently he was still zealous for the Law which was to be the means of that conversion[59]. But the contact with Christianity might well produce startling results. Even the strictest observers of the Law found in the new teaching a motive for striving after holiness which the old had lacked. Belief in the Resurrection of Jesus and the imminence of His return, coupled with the new gifts placed by the Spirit at the disposal of the Church, constituted a power in the human life infinitely greater than anything which the Law had been able to supply[60]. It might well prove that this power could be regarded by the Hellenist as delivering the believer from that duty of obeying the outward letter which, in spite of all concessions, remained the chief obstacle to the conversion of the Gentiles to the Jewish faith[61]. Further it was arguable that the new gifts implied the beginning of that Messianic era, which was to precede the final coming of God to judge the world through His anointed servant. In that age it was tenable that the old Law was to lose its binding force[62].

In any case although the Hellenist still professed to expect the establishment of a Messianic kingdom upon earth, in which God would restore the outcasts of Israel to the home of their fathers and inaugurate for them a period of temporal triumph over their enemies before the final judgment of all mankind, his hopes in this respect were largely a matter of pious theory[63]. In practice he looked forward to the enjoyment of personal immortality after death as the reward

of faithful service of God in his earthly life. Hence, while he was ready to regard the Church as the Messianic kingdom, established in a form somewhat different from his expectations but still recognizable as that foretold by the prophets, he was more interested in the fact that the new powers given to him by the Christian dispensation to attain to righteousness, and the manifest presence of the Holy Ghost in the Christian body, constituted the beginning of that new life, which was to attain to its full consummation after his death[64]. Now if his new life had already begun, there was no reason for supposing that he was in any way bound by the letter of the old Law; and even though he might feel bound to continue to obey it in his own personal life, yet it would be absurd to impose it on those who had never been subject to it[65]. Thus the Hellenist could without any very great departure from his earlier beliefs conclude that the duty of observing the Law had ceased. At best it had been but an incomplete and partial revelation of divine truth[66]; and he might even be led to the view that the old idea of the Law as a binding system of external observances had been an error from the first; such a doctrine could be defended by many passages in which the prophets of old had protested against the belief that the mere compliance with external rules could ever form a substitute for personal holiness[67]. The Master Himself in His conflicts with the Pharisees had uttered many sayings which were at least capable of being interpreted as a complete rejection of any permanent duty of obeying the letter of the Jewish Law as against its spirit, in the kingdom which He had come to establish[68].

Apart from the actual members of the Church there were a certain number of devout Jews who regarded it with sympathy and were inclined to some extent to accept its views. Although reluctant to commit themselves to the distinctive religious system of the Church and that complete surrender of all personal wealth which admission to it involved, they were ready to admit that Jesus was a prophet, even possibly the Messiah. In course of time many persons of this type would probably be led to join the ranks of the new community[69]. None the less it was certain that they would not be willing to accept any revolutionary teaching as to the nature of the Law, teaching which would necessarily arouse implacable hostility among the general public in Jerusalem. Consequently as long as the Church was confined to that city, it was certain that it would tend to conciliate the main body of the nation by deference to the standards of traditional Judaism, on the lines laid down by the Pharisees, even though it did

not pledge its members to any attempt to live as Pharisees. None the less there was in it an element which might at any moment bring forward a very different view.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. See c. II. nn. 7, 14, 17.

2. Acts v. 16 implies that it is necessary to come to Jerusalem in order to obtain assistance from the Apostles. They do not even visit the surrounding villages, as they would necessarily do from time to time if there were organized communities in them. Cf. viii. 1, 4, where the refugees preach *κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας*. The result of this teaching appears in ix. 31, where we read of *ἡ ἐκκλησία καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας κ.τ.λ.*

There are however some isolated Christians outside Jerusalem, since Ananias at Damascus appears to be a permanent resident in the city and not a refugee from Jerusalem (ix. 13). He worships in the synagogue, where S. Paul expects to find other followers of the new "Way" (ix. 2), and is noted for his piety in observing the Law (xxii. 12).

It would seem therefore that while there are isolated Christians, known as such, outside the city, yet there are no organized communities. Such persons continue to worship in the synagogue and to live as devout Jews.

3. Although the Synoptic Gospels never mention the Pharisees by name as responsible for the Crucifixion, yet they appear as taking part in the preliminary and unsuccessful plots to entangle Our Lord in some damaging statement which they can use against Him (Mk xi. 27 *seqq.*, xii. 13 *seqq.*, etc.). They were in fact responsible for the Crucifixion, since they furnished the main body of the unofficial members of the Sanhedrin, as opposed to the sacerdotal members (*G.J.V.* II. 248 *seqq.*), and are therefore the predominant element in the "scribes and elders" of Mk xiv. 1, 53, and the parallel passages in the other Synoptists. The fact that they are not mentioned is remarkable, and raises the question whether the narrative of the Crucifixion in S. Mark may not date from a time when there were Christian Pharisees, whose feelings it was desired to spare.

4. This seems evident, both from the absence in the early speeches of the Apostles of any allusion to the subject, and also from the fact that the Church has supporters among the Pharisees (cf. n. 41).

5. *Antt.* XIII. x. 6.

6. The earlier Pharisees certainly regarded the Messianic kingdom as a supernatural one to be realized by a return of the nation to piety and observance of the Law (*Jub.* xxiii. 26; *Test. Jud.* xxiv. 3). This attitude, although some of the later Pharisees tended to abandon it in favour of direct political action, as in the case of those who supported the rising of Judas of Galilee (*Antt.* XVIII. i. 1, cf. esp. *τὸ θεῖον οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ ἐπὶ συμπράξει τῶν βουλευμάτων εἰς τὸ κατορθοῦν συμπροθυμεῖσθαι*), and certain followers of the school of Shammai at the time of the rebellion (*Life and Times*, I. 239), was that of the Pharisee members of the Sanhedrin at the time of the Crucifixion. Cf. nn. 9, 10 and 18.

7. The teaching of Our Lord in many cases incorporated elements and language drawn from the more spiritual utterances of the great Rabbis and Pharisaic writers. A comparison of the following passages is instructive:

Mt. v. 19	*Test. Lev.* xiii. 9
,, v. 28	,, *Benj.* viii. 2
,, v. 40 *seqq.*	,, *Zeb.* vii
,, vi. 7	*Pirke Aboth* ii. 17
,, vi. 22–3	*Test. Iss.* iv. 6
,, vi. 24	,, *Judah* xviii. 6
,, vii. 2	,, *Zeb.* v. 3
,, vii. 24 *seqq.*	*Pirke Aboth* iii. 22
,, ix. 37	,, ,, ii. 19

Mt. xii. 45	*Test. Reub.* ii. 1
,, xiii. 12	*Pirke Aboth* i. 13
,, xviii. 20	,, ,, iii. 3
,, xviii. 35	*Test. Gad* vii. 7
,, xix. 28	,, *Judah* xxv. 1
,, xxv. 34	*Test. Benj.* x. 6
,, xxv. 35–6	,, *Jos.* i. 6
Lk. x. 19, 20	,, *Sym.* vi. 6; *Levi* xviii. 12
,, xii. 45	,, *Jos.* iii. 5
,, xiv. 12–14	*Pirke Aboth* i. 5
,, xvii. 3	*Test. Gad* vi. 3
,, xvii. 7–10	*Pirke Aboth* i. 3
,, xvii. 26	*Tr. San. Mishna* x. 3^a, 3^b (S.P.C.K. translation)
,, xxii. 27	*Test. Jos.* xvii. 8

8. For the general history of the two main parties of Pharisees and Sadducees cf. *G.J.V.* II. 455 *seqq.*, and for the Pharisee converts in the primitive Church cf. n. 41.

It is plain from Acts xxiii. 6 *seqq.* and from the history of S. James, "the Lord's brother" (see below, c. III. § ii. n. 36), that the solidarity among the Pharisees was too strong for them to agree to any persecution of their brethren at the hands of their opponents. It is therefore probable that the attitude of Gamaliel in the Sanhedrin was to some extent dictated by the knowledge that there were among the Christians Pharisees who were likely to suffer in any general persecution conducted by that body.

9. This fear emerges clearly in Acts v. 28. In iii. 17 S. Peter has already repudiated any idea of this kind, and S. Luke intends that statement to be an account of the attitude of the Twelve towards the question of revenge. But see n. 14.

10. Acts iv. 17 and v. 24 reveal the fear of the Sanhedrin that the new movement may be one of those Messianic outbursts which had since the days of Judas of Galilee been a continual menace. They grew in frequency with the growth of resentment against Roman misgovernment, especially after Caligula's attempt to set up his statue in the Temple. For records of risings of this character cf. *B.J.* II. viii. 1; *Antt.* XVIII. i. 1 (the rising of Judas of Galilee at the time of the census, noted by Josephus as the beginning of the movement in favour of the establishment by force of the Messianic kingdom); *Antt.* XX. i. 1; *B.J.* II. xii. 4, xiii; *Antt.* XX. viii. 6. In the two last passages Josephus describes the movement, hitherto in the hands of men whom he calls λῃσταί, as taking a new form. The λῃσταί proper become *sicarii* conducting a campaign of assassination within the city, while the Messianic agitators are described as πλάνοι, γόητες and ἀπατεῶνες. It seems however that the distinction is only intended to explain the fact that the growing complicity of the High Priests with the fanatics, and the incompetence and corruption of the Roman authorities, made it safe for the more unscrupulous elements among them to carry on a campaign of private assassination within the city, while the impostors, who proclaimed, and no doubt often believed themselves to be, the Messiah tried to rouse the nation at large to rebellion. Cf. Acts xxi. 38, where the followers of the Egyptian, classed by Josephus as one of the impostors, are described as *sicarii*. To the above references may be added the Samaritan fanatic of *Antt.* XVIII. iv. 1, and Barabbas (Mk xv. 7), while it is possible that the Galileans of Lk. xiii. 1 were at any rate suspected of complicity in one of the revolutionary plots of the time. For a similar suspicion in the case of Our Lord cf. n. 18. It may be noted that in Mt. xxvii. 63 He is described as a πλάνος, as are the Messianic impostors of *B.J.* II. xiii. 4.

It is of course impossible to estimate how far the leaders in these movements were in fact either genuine patriots or honest and misguided fanatics, and how far they were merely criminals. A similar difficulty has to be faced in the attempt to judge the character of any nationalist movement which resorts to violence.

11. The Sadducees, in so far as they were members of the Sanhedrin, would seem to have been limited to the persons who had actually occupied the office of High Priest and their immediate relatives. They represented the survivors of the

aristocratic priestly families, from which the Sanhedrin had been drawn in the pre-Maccabean period, and the newer and lower class introduced to the High Priesthood by Herod the Great in his desire to depreciate the importance of the office (see c. II. Appendix). For their general beliefs and attitude cf. *G.J.V.* II. 475 *seqq.* Their religious attitude was that of the older Judaism, and they rejected both the traditions of the elders, by which the Pharisees expanded and interpreted the Law, and also the development of belief in the Resurrection and personal immortality of the individual soul. They were however also the heirs of the pre-Maccabean tradition of attempting to preserve the prosperity of the nation by adopting a conciliatory attitude towards the Gentile powers on which its existence depended. As the representatives of the wealthier class in the nation it was natural that they should be opposed to impracticable schemes for rebellions in which they stood to lose more than others. Cf. the notes following.

12. *Antt.* XIII. x. 6, XV. 5, XVII. ii. 4, XVIII. i. 4. We have no information of the relative strength of the two parties on the Sanhedrin, but it is clear from Acts v. 34 *seqq.*, xxiii. 6 *seqq.*, that the influence of the Pharisees was too strong to allow their opponents to pursue a policy to which the Pharisees did not agree. The latter passage suggests that the two parties were at that moment more or less equal in numbers and it is possible that in practice the membership of the Sanhedrin was equally divided between the two parties.

13. How far the leading representatives of the Sadducees at this period deserved such a criticism is perhaps uncertain. But it is clearly that impression of them which was fostered by their contrast with the Pharisees, whose religious outlook was alike more highly developed and more calculated to impress the public.

14. Jas ii. 6, v. 1, where the rich are pre-eminently the Sadducees (cf. the references to *Antt.* in n. 12).

15. In Mk xi. 18 the hostility of the chief priests dates directly from the cleansing of the Temple, from the traffic in which a large part of the revenues of the Sadducean families was derived (*Life and Times*, I. 371). The exact extent to which the language of S. Mark can be pressed to mean that Our Lord's action was the cause of that hostility is doubtful; but it is clear that any attempt by His followers to preserve that attitude and to proclaim it in public in Jerusalem would have forced the Sadducees to take far stronger measures to suppress them than those which we meet in the Acts.

16. Mk xv. 9, 12, Jno. xviii. 35, 39, xix. 14, 15, 21, 22. Both narratives bring out Pilate's attitude to the Jews in a manner which has been lost in Mt. and Lk. Their account is entirely in keeping with that given in *B.J.* II. ix. 2–4; *Antt.* XVIII. iii. 1, 2. In all these passages there emerges a love of outraging Jewish sentiment merely for its own sake, which seems also to be implied in the incident of Lk. xiii. 1. In Philo's account of him (*Leg. ad Gaium* 38, M. II. 589) we have a similar account of his character (*οὐκ ἐπὶ τιμῇ Τιβερίου μᾶλλον ἢ ἕνεκα τοῦ λυπῆσαι τὸ πλῆθος*).

17. Mk xv. 15, Mt. xxvii. 24, Lk. xxiii. 23.

18. Both S. Mark and S. Matthew fail to record the bringing of any specific political charge against Our Lord by the Sanhedrin. It is however implied in Mk xv. 2, Mt. xxvii. 11, and is clearly brought out in Lk. xxiii. 2 and Jno. xix. 12, which supply information without which the accounts of the other Gospels would be unintelligible. It is hardly likely that the danger of a riot instigated by the Sanhedrin was sufficiently serious by itself to force Pilate to give way, if there had not also been the fear of an appeal to Tiberius by the Jews, based on his alleged failure to suppress a dangerous revolutionary movement. For Pilate's anxiety to avoid any appeal to Tiberius cf. the reference to Philo quoted in n. 16.

For the fear of the Sanhedrin that Our Lord contemplated an attempt to lead a revolutionary movement cf. Jno. xi. 47 and Mk xiv. 2 and the parallel passages in the Synoptic narratives. It is not clear how far the fear was genuinely entertained, and how far it was merely a pretext for persuading Pilate to agree to the Crucifixion. The Marcan narrative is so vague in its whole account of the Passion that it gives no reason at all for the desire of the High Priests to get rid of Our Lord; and it is possible that this vagueness is intentional. During the earlier part of the period covered by the writings of the N.T. there were obvious motives for dissociating Christianity from any of the revolutionary movements in Palestine. It is therefore

by no means improbable that the Johannine account of the motives of the Sanhedrin is correct, and that they were genuinely afraid of Our Lord on the ground that He intended to inaugurate a violent Messianic movement. Such a danger might naturally be feared after His triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and the claim to authority implied in the cleansing of the Temple. The Fourth Gospel suggests that many of Our Lord's followers would have been willing to follow Him in such an attempt (Jno. vi. 13): presumably most of those present at His entry to Jerusalem expected Him to make it. It may be noted that in *Antt.* XVIII. v. 2 Josephus attributes the imprisonment of S. John Baptist to the fact that Herod Antipas suspected him of a similar design.

19. The impossibility of making any form of legal persecution effective emerges clearly in Acts iv. 15 *seqq.* and v. 24 *seqq.* [It is of course possible that the two narratives in fact refer to the same incident, and are duplicates drawn from different sources. On the other hand apart from the incident of Acts v. 19 there is no inherent improbability in either story, nor yet in a double attempt of the Sanhedrin to suppress the new movement, ending in the refusal of the Pharisees to co-operate in such a policy. The former narrative is obviously well-informed as to the members of the party of the Sadducees and the policing of Jerusalem, while the appearance of SS. Peter and John is more probable than the vague "Apostles" of v. 18. In the second account the angelic deliverance looks suspiciously like an anticipation of xii. 7 *seqq.* On the other hand in this second narrative we have the detailed and clearly well-informed account of the intervention of Gamaliel, for which S. Luke could draw on good authority, though he appears to be in error as to the date of Theudas. This part of the narrative can hardly be rejected, and although there must always remain a possibility that we have the same incident recorded from two different points of view, it is on the whole more probable that there were several attempts at suppression before the refusal of the Pharisees to continue such a policy.]

20. The sacerdotal party during the period covered by the Gospels and the earlier part of the Acts are represented as following a definite policy of endeavouring to check popular risings (*Antt.* XVIII. i. 1, XX. vi. 1; *B.J.* II. xvii. 3, cf. Jno. x. 24, xi. 47), while at the same time using diplomatic means to preserve the Jewish religion from violation by the Imperial authorities (*Antt.* XVIII. v. 3, viii. 4, XX. viii. 5, 11; *Vita* 3; *B.J.* II. xiv. 8, xv. 4, cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 32, 38, M. II. 580, 590). At a later period they were forced to abandon this attitude, partly by the continued aggression of Roman officials and the consequent increase of fanaticism (*Antt.* XX. vi. 2 indicates that the leading Sadducees were in fact involved in the reprisals against the Samaritans under Cumanus), and partly by their complicity with the less reputable among the extremists. (See below, c. v. § ii. n. 18.) The result was that they were unable to check the rebellion, and were forced to come forward as its leaders (*B.J.* II. XX. 3). It was the natural result of their past policy that they were thrown over by the elements which they had previously endeavoured to control. (Cf. *Antt.* XX. viii. 5; *B.J.* II. xvii. 9 and the various assassinations of the moderate nationalist leaders during the rebellion, and the story of Josephus himself.)

The situation made it natural that the Sadducees should be opposed to the Christian movement, at first for fear that it should prove a cause of possible political unrest, and later in order to vindicate their zeal for the Jewish religion in the eyes of the extremists. The latter section of the population were bitterly opposed to the Church (c. III. § ii. n. 21 and c. v. § ii. n. 18), and also naturally suspected the Sadducees of undue friendship towards the Roman oppressor. The Sadducees thus later allowed themselves to be drawn into illegal measures for persecuting the Church (Acts xxiii. 12 *seqq.*; cf. notes referred to above). This connivance however was inevitably bound to react unfavourably on their own position as upholders of law and order, and supporters of the Roman government.

21. In the absence of any evidence to check S. Luke's narrative, it is impossible to decide how far the figures of Acts ii. 41 and iv. 4 can be accepted as reliable. It is however to be noted that S. Luke in this respect contrasts favourably with Josephus and other Jewish writers of the time (*Antt.* XX. v. 3: 20,000 or, according to *B.J.* II. xii. 1, 10,000 killed in a panic; xiii. 5: 30,000 followers of the Egyptian (where S. Luke gives 4000); xiv. 3: 3,000,000 Jews in Jerusalem at the Passover; xviii. 1:

20,000 massacred in an hour; xx. 6: 100,000 men in Josephus' army). Cf. also the absurd exaggerations of 2 Macc. v. 14, x. 17, 31, xii. 26, xv. 27.

22. For the Church as a sect of Judaism cf. the use of such phrases as ὁδός (Acts ix. 2) and αἵρεσις (Acts xxiv. 5, 14) and the implications of S. Paul's account of Christianity before Herod Agrippa II in Acts xxvi. 3 and 21 *seqq.*

For the use of the Temple cf. Acts ii. 42, iii. 1, v. 12, 20, 42. In these passages the new sect appears to be sufficiently tolerated to use Solomon's porch (for this cf. Davies in Hastings' *D.B.* IV. 713, Art. "Temple") as a regular meeting-place for expounding its doctrines. It is to be presumed that this became unsafe after the death of S. Stephen, but the Christians continue to worship in the Temple (Acts xxi. 24, xxii. 17). [The term αἵρεσις does not of course necessarily imply that the persons following it are "heretical" in their beliefs, as is shown by the fact that Josephus applies it equally to the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes.]

23. The identification of Our Lord with the "Righteous Servant" of Is. liii is ascribed by S. Luke in the Acts to S. Peter (iii. 14), S. Stephen (vii. 52), S. Philip (viii. 32 *seqq.*) and (in S. Paul's account of the vision) to Ananias of Damascus (xxii. 14). He never ascribes it to S. Paul himself. The accuracy of his treatment is confirmed by the rest of N.T. literature. The prophecy of Is. liii is applied to Our Lord either directly or by implication in the use of the title "Righteous" or "the Righteous One" in Mt. viii. 17 (peculiar to this Gospel), xx. 28 (=Mk x. 45), Lk. xxii. 37 (cf. the implied reference in xxiv. 26), Jno. xii. 38, Jas v. 6, 1 Pet. i. 19, ii. 22 *seqq.*, 1 Jno. ii. 1 and in the imagery of the Lamb in the Apocalypse.

On the other hand S. Paul never makes any Messianic use of this prophecy himself. There are only two possible cases of it in his writings, Ro. iv. 25 and 1 Cor. xv. 3. In both cases the reminiscence is a slight one and in both cases it is used in passages where S. Paul is dealing with the Resurrection. Here he is repeating what he has learnt from others as a central piece of Christian evidence and naturally falls into the language of his informants who were in the habit of making constant use of the prophecy (cf. ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον in 1 Cor. xv. 3), and not unnaturally reminiscences of their use of the prophecy have crept in. Otherwise he does not allude to it, and a similar avoidance of it may be noted in the writer to the Hebrews. This can hardly be accidental. Nor is it difficult to see why S. Paul should avoid the use of a prophecy in which Our Lord was referred to as "the Righteous One." To a Jewish reader the title ὁ δίκαιος inevitably suggested one who observed the Law, and S. Paul could hardly use it without suggesting that Our Lord redeemed mankind through His perfect observance of the Jewish Law, a view which would hardly have commended itself to his theology. In any case S. Paul as a Rabbi of the Pharisaic type naturally bases his main arguments on the Law, and would hardly care to make any prophetic passage a central point of his teaching; in this respect his method differs sharply from that of the popular Judaism represented by S. Peter. It is indeed somewhat remarkable that S. Luke should make S. Stephen refer to Our Lord as "the Righteous One"; he might have been expected to avoid it for the same reason as S. Paul. It is however quite possible that S. Stephen had not worked out his system with sufficient consistency to see that the title told against his argument and therefore continued to use the language of his fellow-Christians at Jerusalem. In any case it seems clear that this identification of Our Lord with the Righteous Servant of Isaiah liii is an element of non-Pauline Christianity, which represents the outlook of the most primitive period of the Church of Jerusalem and which S. Paul deliberately avoids. See further Appendix I to this Chapter.

For the emphasis of the first Christians on the fact of the Resurrection cf. Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, iv. 10, x. 40, xiii. 31, xvii. 31, xxvi. 8, 23, 1 Cor. xv. 3 *seqq.*, where note ἐν πρώτοις. Whatever the facts may have been, it is clear that the claim that it could be proved by the testimony of living witnesses was the central point of all apostolic teaching.

24. The attempt to reject the whole of the eschatological element of Our Lord's teaching as recorded in the Gospels may be regarded as too unscientific to need serious consideration. The apocalyptic point of view is too widely diffused among the writers of the N.T. to make it possible to suppose that it was introduced to Christianity by individual Christians: the attempt to introduce it would in the

controversies of the first Christian century have been met with violent opposition from one quarter or another, unless it had formed part of the original teaching given by Our Lord to His disciples. On the other hand it is not easy to be certain how far His teaching has been amplified by the introduction of conceptions current among His contemporaries and reminiscences of contemporary literature. Outside the Gospels there are several cases in which current Jewish ideas have been introduced for which there is no authority in Our Lord's recorded teaching. Thus in 1 Pet. i. 4 we find the conception of the kingdom of heaven as already existing, but concealed in heaven, cf. Rev. xxi. 2. (The conception is also implied in Gal. iv. 26; for S. Paul's indebtedness to contemporary writers see below, c. IV. § i. n. 9.) This conception is nowhere attributed to Our Lord; but it appears in 4 Esdr. vii. 26, xiii. 36, 2 Bar. iv. 3, 1 En. xc. 29, and the showing of Paradise to Moses in *Bibl. Antt.* xiii. 8. Similarly the temporary Messianic kingdom of Rev. xx has been adopted from such passages as 1 En. xci. 12 *seqq.*, 4 Esdr. vii. 28, 2 Bar. xxix, xxx. (While in Esdras the duration of the Messianic kingdom is to be 400 years, in Rev. it is to last a thousand, apparently under the influence of the beliefs represented in 2 Bar. *loc. cit.*, 1 En. x. 19.) The length to which the introduction of such teaching went is shown by the fact that Irenaeus (*Haer.* v. xxxiii. 3) quotes Papias as actually ascribing to Our Lord the grotesque belief of 2 Bar. xxix. 5.

Our Lord's eschatological teaching as recorded by the Synoptists reveals a considerable resemblance with that of contemporary writers. This is particularly noticeable in the case of His use of the O.T. Thus in Mk xiii. 19 he uses Dan. xii. 1 (=Joel ii. 2), which also appears in *Ass. Moys.* viii. 1, and in Mk xiii. 24 He quotes Is. xiii. 10, which appears also in *Test. Lev.* iv. 1 and *Ass. Moys.* x. 5. For a resemblance independent of the O.T. may be noted the shortening of the days in Mk xiii. 20, for which cf. 2 Bar. xx. 1, liv. 1 and *Bibl. Antt.* xix. 13. The parallels between Our Lord's teachings and those of contemporary literature are more marked however in Mt. and Lk. Thus in Mt. xxv. 36 there is a resemblance to *Test. Jos.* i. 6, which can hardly be accidental. The whole parable is strongly coloured with reminiscences of 1 Enoch (for *v.* 31 cf. 1 En. lxii. 5, and for *v.* 41 cf. 1 En. xxi). This colouring however is no greater than might easily be due to the current ideas of the time; in any case however the whole passage is open to considerable suspicion of being an early Christian interpolation (cf. Allen and MacNeile's commentaries *ad loc.*). There is a similar reminiscence of 1 En. lxii. 5 in Mt. xix. 28, where again the difference between the Matthean version of the saying and that given in Lk. xxii. 30 suggests that the reminiscence may be due to the compiler of the first Gospel.

Such an expansion of Our Lord's words seems clearly traceable in the versions of the eschatological discourse of Mk xiii as it appears in Mt. and Lk. Thus in Mt. xxiv. 3 the addition of the words *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* introduces a phrase which is a commonplace of Jewish apocalyptic, while *vv.* 10–12 would appear to recall the difficulties of the Church during the Jewish rebellion (cf. n. 20). Here the idea of *v.* 12 recalls 4 Esdr. v. 2. The additions in Lk. xxi are instructive, since they show a very distinct resemblance to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. This is not surprising in view of S. Paul's familiarity with that work. The following instances are of interest.

Lk. xxi. 15. *ᾗ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῶν.*

v. 20 (the overthrow of Jerusalem). *γνῶτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς.*

v. 24. *πεσοῦνται ἐν στόματι μαχαίρης καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πάντα.*

Test. Sym. v. 5. *οὐ δυνήσονται πρὸς Λευεὶ ἀντιστῆναι.*

Test. Dan. v. 13. *οὐκέτι ὑπομενεῖ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐρήμωσιν οὐδὲ αἰχμαλωτισθήσεται Ἰσραήλ.* *Jud.* xxiii. 3. *ναοῦ θεοῦ ἐμπρησμόν, γῆς ἐρήμωσιν, ὑμῶν δὲ αὐτῶν δουλείαν ἐν ἔθνεσιν.* *Lev.* xv. 1. *ὁ ναὸς ἔρημος ἔσται καὶ ὑμεῖς αἰχμάλωτοι ἔσεσθε εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.*

It is perhaps open to question whether here the very circumstantial prediction of the fall of Jerusalem is not in fact due simply to a Pauline amplification of the discourse of Mk xiii, based on the supposed predictions of the *Testaments*, and not necessarily to the fact that S. Luke was writing after the event.

Of the other Lucan additions to the discourse for *vv.* 25, 26 cf. 4 Esdr. ix. 3 for *v.* 28, 1 En. li. 2; for *v.* 34, 4 Esdr. vi. 34; and for the last clause of *v.* 36, 1 En. lxii. 8 and similar passages in that book.

The fact that these reminiscences of current apocalyptic literature all occur in the additions made by S. Matthew and S. Luke to the eschatological discourse recorded in Mk xiii indicates that there was a tendency from a very early period in the history of the Church to amplify this side of Our Lord's teaching with sayings found in other literature of this class and ideas current among the Jews of the period. In view of the wide dissemination of a belief in the early establishment of the Messianic kingdom this is only natural. It is of course possible that some of the sayings in question are genuine, and that some of the resemblances are accidental; but it can scarcely be doubted that there has been a considerable amount of amplification of Our Lord's original words with matter drawn from other sources, while it is doubtful whether He Himself made any use of non-canonical writings of this character.

For the currency of eschatological ideas at this period cf. above, n. 10. Cf. also *B.J.* VI. v.

25. Acts ii. 38, iii. 19, cf. x. 43.

The adoption of Baptism as a ceremony of admission to the Christian society was of course natural both from the aptitude of the rite as a symbol of cleansing from sin, and also from its familiarity to the Judaism of the time. The adoption of the rite by S. John the Baptist needs no explanation from non-Jewish sources, since it would easily suggest itself to anyone who was familiar with the ceremonial washings of orthodox Judaism, especially that employed in the admission of proselytes (*G.J.V.* III. 181 *seqq.*). A similar ceremonial was used by the Essenes on the admission of new members (*B.J.* II. viii. 7). Cf. also the practice of the otherwise unknown prophet Banus in *Vita* 2.

Although the original purpose of the levitical washings was the removal of ceremonial defilement, it was natural that they should be regarded as a symbol of the moral conversion necessary for all true religion, and this symbolical interpretation is as old as Isaiah. (Is. i. 16, where the use of washing as a symbol of repentance is clearly suggested by the ritual of the Temple.) For the familiarity of orthodox Judaism with the metaphor of washing for the removal of sin cf. also Jer. ii. 22, Ps. li. 2, 7, etc. Thus there is no justification for going outside conventional Jewish ideas for an explanation of the reasons which led the Baptist to regard a ceremonial washing as a suitable form of admission to his new community of those who by repentance sought to save themselves from the general judgment of all mankind, the imminence of which he had been sent to proclaim. It was equally natural that the Twelve should revive its use, since several of them at least had been followers of the Baptist before the first public appearance of Our Lord, if the tradition of the Fourth Gospel is correct. On the other hand it is difficult to suppose that the command ascribed to Our Lord in Mt. xxviii. 19 is merely based on the later practice of the Church. Although it is possible that its insertion here with the Trinitarian formula is due to the desire to base the later practice on a direct command of Our Lord, it is scarcely possible to suppose that He would have left no indication as to the method of admission of new disciples, or that the practice should have come to be regarded as inevitable, and have been accepted without controversy or hesitation, unless it rested upon His direct authority. There is accordingly no justification for doubting the statement of S. Matthew in so far as it ascribes the institution of Baptism, or rather its transference from the Johannine to the Christian community, to Our Lord, although the precise point at which the command was given may be open to doubt.

Doctrinally it is irrelevant to inquire how far the forgiveness of sins is conveyed by baptism, or how far it depends on the repentance which is the condition which precedes baptism. The question is one which could only arise in an atmosphere entirely alien to that of the New Testament. Naturally there could be no tendency to suppose, among the early Jewish converts, that forgiveness could be obtained without repentance, by the mere use of an external form; but there would be equally little tendency, among Christians who still accepted without question the obligation of obedience to the Law, to suppose that the external form could be neglected. There would be even less tendency among the Gentile communities,

founded by S. Paul at a later period, to suppose that the external ceremony could safely be neglected. Hence both in the Acts and the Pauline Epistles the moral transition from a state of sin to a state of forgiveness (in the Acts), or a new life of righteousness (in the Pauline writings), is concurrent with baptism, and is not regarded as needing to be distinguished from it.

26. In Acts ii. 39–40 the gift of the Holy Ghost is promised to those who seek to save themselves from the present generation, while in ii. 17 it is one of the signs of the imminence of the end foretold by Joel. Similarly in iii. 20 acceptance of it is the means by which the return of Our Lord is to be brought about (cf. below, n. 52). By receiving it the Christian is delivered from sin and entitled to a share in the Messianic kingdom, which will shortly be established.

27. See Appendix on the Primitive Eucharist.

28. Acts ii. 43 *seqq.*, iv. 32–v. 11. Apparently the sin of Ananias consists in his endeavouring to gain admission to the Church under false pretences. Since the Church could not hold property as a corporation, and since it would obviously be unsafe to depend simply on the chance of a fairly regular accession of wealthy converts, it seems probable that the sales of land were only expected in cases of comparatively large estates, and that the owners of small properties in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem continued to work them for the common benefit, while the other able-bodied members of the community earned such wages as they could for the common purse. This seems to be implied in iv. 34, where the houses sold are presumably only those not actually inhabited by the convert, or those larger than he personally needed. In some cases indeed it is clear that owners of large houses retain them as meeting-places for the Church (Acts xii. 12, where from the fact that S. James the Lord's brother and the main body of the brethren are not present, it would seem that the house of Mary the mother of John Mark is only one of several so used).

The view suggested above is supported by the practice of the Essenes, who pursued a system of communism (*B.J.* II. viii. 3; *Antt.* XVIII. i. 5; Philo, *Quod Omn. Prob. Lib.* 12, M. II. 457), but subsisted on the labour of their members (*B.J.* II. viii. 5) and on the produce of small holdings of land, which were from a legal point of view the property of individuals (Philo, *loc. cit.*, οἱ μὲν γεωπονουντες οὐδ' ἀποτομὰς γῆς μεγαλας κτώμενοι ἀλλ' ὅσον πρὸς ἀναγκαίας τοῦ βίου προσόδους ἐκπορίζοντες).

There is no reason to suppose that the Church deliberately intended to imitate the practice of the Essenes, especially in view of the fact that the rejection of the Temple-system was one of the primary features of the latter body, and that they deliberately abandoned the cities in order to form settlements in isolated places. Since both the Church and the Essenes came into being at the same period, and with similar objects, *i.e.* the founding of a social organization, intended to enable its members to attain to a standard of ascetic perfection, conceived in terms of a spiritual interpretation of the Mosaic Law, it would be surprising if they did not show a great measure of similarity. Naturally there is also a considerable resemblance between both bodies and the Egyptian Therapeutae in Philo, *De Vit. Cont.* (M. II. 471 *seqq.*). [An instructive example of the extent to which social experiments with similar objects undertaken in similar social surroundings tend to resemble one another may be found in John H. Noyes, *History of American Socialisms*.]

29. See Appendix on the Primitive Eucharist.

30. The extent to which the miracles recorded in the history of the early development of the Church can be accepted as historical is a matter which cannot be discussed with profit, since the view taken of them is bound to depend not on the character of the evidence, but on the *a priori* view of the writer as to the possibility or impossibility of events of the kind. It is however plain that the growth of the Church largely depended on phenomena accepted as miraculous at the time, such as healings of diseases, speaking with tongues and the like. That such cures were fairly frequent is clear not only from the Acts, but from such passages as 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 2 Cor. xii. 12, Gal. iii. 5, in which S. Paul appeals to the miracles which accompanied his labours, in order to confute opponents, who are obviously unable to deny them. Whatever the explanation may be, it is impossible to deny the historicity of a number of "miracles" of this sort.

It would seem that any popular leader who aspired to acceptance as the Messiah was expected to enforce his claim by miraculous powers. Cf. below, c. III. § i. n. 8.

31. For the day of Pentecost, and "speaking with tongues," see Appendix on Spiritual Gifts.

32. See Appendix on these phenomena.

33. The prominence of the position accorded to S. John in the Acts might be attributed to some local interest in him in the circles for which the book was written, were it not confirmed by Gal. ii. 9. In view of his unimportance to the actual narrative it would seem highly probable that it is to some such local interest that the record of the historical fact owes its retention. See the Note on c. VII. § ii.

34. In Acts vi. 2 the Apostles are responsible for the whole business of supervising the common meals of the Church, a function which in view of the close connection between the common meal and the Eucharist would inevitably carry with it the duty of presiding at the latter. See Appendix on the Primitive Eucharist.

35. Acts iv. 33, v. 12 *seqq.*, vi. 2–4. For their disciplinary authority cf. v. 1–11.

36. For the distinction between the Twelve and others who had seen the Lord see Appendix on the Apostolate.

37. This seems to be indicated by the ease with which S. Stephen and S. Philip assume a position of prominence in the Christian world after their appointment for a function entirely different from that which they actually exercise. Such a rise to eminence would be easy in a loosely constituted body in which there were certain definite leaders, and below them a certain number of persons who were in fact prominent, without possessing any definitely recognized rank. Cf. Acts xv. 22, where the words *ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς* imply a position of eminence which is entirely unofficial. Although S. Barnabas would seem to have seen the Lord (see Appendix on the Apostolate), it is probable that his eminence is to be attributed rather to his benefaction recorded in iv. 36 and his personal gifts than to his position as an eye-witness of some part of Our Lord's earthly life.

38. See n. 2. Although the language of v. 16 might seem to exclude even the existence of communities in such villages as Bethany, it may be presumed that there were Christians residing in them. It is however probable that they joined in the worship of the Church in Jerusalem, and that there were no organized groups of Christians in these suburbs.

39. It seems only reasonable to suppose that there were persons in Galilee who remembered Our Lord's ministry and had heard of His Resurrection, since we find Christians so far afield as Damascus.

40. See n. 23 *ad fin.* It is indeed likely that the beliefs of these provincial Christians varied considerably. There may well have been many who followed the ethical teaching of Jesus, but had not heard of His Resurrection, or, if they had, did not believe it. They may have regarded Him as merely a moral teacher, rather than as the Messiah.

41. We do not read of Pharisee converts until Acts xv. 15, but it is clear that at this point they exercise a very considerable influence. Among such converts must be classed S. James "the Lord's brother" (see c. III. § ii. nn. 35 *seqq.*), and Joseph of Arimathea, who from the description given in Mk xv. 43 is clearly a member of the Pharisaic wing of the Sanhedrin. To these two must be added Nicodemus, if the mention of him in Jno. iii. 1 and xix. 39 be historical. Since S. James does not apparently uphold the demand of his fellow-Pharisees at the Council there must have been several others. According to Lk. xiii. 31, xiv. 1 there was a section of the Pharisees which was on friendly terms with Our Lord until the beginning of His final journey to Jerusalem. It would seem however that the Pharisee converts must have been very few in number. Even Josephus (*Antt.* XVII. ii. 4) does not give more than 6000 Pharisees in the whole nation, and it is fairly safe to assume that this is an exaggeration. Had there been many such converts the influence of the Pharisees on the general public would have led to the conversion of a far larger proportion of the nation than would seem to have been the case. (For their influence cf. the references to Josephus in n. 12 above.)

For the attitude of the Pharisees to the Law as the supreme revelation of God, created before the creation and inseparable from the divine nature, see Oesterley and Box, *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 135 *seqq.*, where reasons are

given for believing that the development of this side of rabbinical Judaism is alluded to and combated in the Fourth Gospel. Allowance must be made for the possibility that the writer of this Gospel has permitted his record of the teaching of Our Lord to be coloured by a desire to discredit a glorification of the Law by the great Pharisaic teachers which did not reach its full development until after the fall of Jerusalem. None the less it is difficult to see how it was possible for a Pharisee to remain a Pharisee after his acceptance of Our Lord as the Messiah in view of the vigour with which He denounces the Pharisees and their teaching. It seems probable that such converts would adopt the line of thought suggested in the text, urging such passages as Mt. v. 18, xxiii. 3, 23. It must further be remembered that Pharisaism at this stage of its development was not a stereotyped system of teaching comparable to the later rabbinical development of Judaism. It would seem that a belief in the Resurrection and the other main dogmas of the Pharisees and a scrupulous observance of the Law and the oral traditions of the great teachers of the Pharisaic tradition was enough to justify the claim to be regarded as a Pharisee. Cf. c. III. § ii. n. 35. In this way it would be possible for a Pharisee to become a Christian without abandoning his Pharisaism; the later development of the glorification of the Law and of hostility to the Gentiles would seem as yet not to have advanced to such an extent as to render the two professions incompatible. At a slightly later period the combination would scarcely have been possible.

42. Cf. Lk. xvi. 17, Mt. v. 17 *seqq.*, xiii. 52, and the whole tendency of the first Gospel. However much the attitude of S. Matthew to the Law may have been coloured by the beliefs and practices of Hebrew Christianity, it is clear that it must have been able to appeal to a considerable element in Our Lord's teaching which could at least be understood as implying that the Law, interpreted in the light of His teaching, was to continue in the kingdom.

43. See n. 28. For the support of widows and other helpless dependents cf. Acts vi. 1, Jas i. 27.

44. It is only as the expression of the attitude of the primitive Church in Jerusalem that the Epistle of S. James becomes intelligible. It stands for an extreme and sometimes rather formal piety, of which we have no trace elsewhere in the N.T. No document is more vigorous in denouncing sin (cf. iv. 4, 8, v. 1–6), yet the sins denounced in it amount to no more than anger, respect of persons, quarrelling, presumptuousness (conceived in a very formal manner), riches and swearing. It is uncertain whether the letter is intended for Jewish Christians of the Dispersion or for the Christian public in general; but in either case it quite clearly presupposes a standard of moral development, which in fact is far in advance of that prevalent among any body of Christians outside Jerusalem. The nearest approach to be found in the N.T. is the Epistle to the Hebrews (but cf. xii. 16, xiii. 4). In general writers to Christians living outside Palestine find it necessary to warn their readers against a very different class of sins. (Cf. Gal. v. 19 *seqq.*, 1 Cor. v. 11, vi. 9, 1 Thess. iv. 3 *seqq.*, Eph. v. 3 *seqq.*, Col. iii. 5 *seqq.*, 1 Pet. ii. 11, iv. 3, etc.) Even in addressing Jewish Christians of the Dispersion a far lower state of moral development is presupposed. (Cf. n. 50.) The natural explanation would seem to be that the writer, although addressing Christians outside Palestine, none the less assumes that their moral development will be similar to that of the Christians with whom he is familiar. This is possible, if the author was in fact familiar with the piety of the Church of Jerusalem, and practically ignorant of the conditions prevalent both among the Christians of the Gentile Churches and the Jews of the Dispersion, whether Christian or not. (Cf. also c. VII. § i. n. 14.)

45. It is only natural that the people of Jerusalem, who depended largely for their living on the fact that the city was the centre of Jewish religion and derived its prosperity from this position, should be largely dominated by the leading exponents of Jewish piety. The change in public opinion in Jerusalem from enthusiasm in favour of Our Lord at the time of His triumphal entry to Jerusalem to violent hostility at the time of His trial seems inexplicable, except on the supposition that the enthusiasm was largely due to the influence of the pilgrims from Galilee (so definitely in Mt. xxi. 10, Lk. xix. 37, where the "disciples" must be Galileans), temporarily taken up by the citizens, while the reaction was due to the fact that the Pharisees had by the time of the arrest succeeded in resuming their domination

over the populace of Jerusalem. This is confirmed by the narrative of Josephus as to the part played by Galilee in the events which led up to the Jewish rebellion. The first appeal to arms comes from Judas of Galilee in the governorship of Quirinius, and his sons were still a source of danger under Tiberius Alexander about A.D. 46. At the outbreak of the war the recognized leaders of the nation in Jerusalem attempted to retain the management of affairs, with the support of the moderate elements in the city; the final cause of their failure was the arrival of John of Gischala with his following of Zealots from Galilee. This region was also the birth-place of the brigand-leader Simon, the son of Gioras, a Gerasene by origin (*B.J.* IV. ix. 3). For the effect of the arrival of the Zealots at Jerusalem cf. *ib.* IV. iii, and for the Galilean body-guard of John of Gischala IV. ix. 10. Although there were no doubt numerous fanatics in Jerusalem, it seems clear that the main body of the population continued to regard the old ruling class as their leaders. The actual outbreak of the rebellion only became inevitable when one of them came forward to lead it in the person of Eleazar, son of Ananias the High Priest, who proposed the abolition of the sacrifice for the Emperor (*B.J.* II. xvii. 2), and it would seem that but for him moderate counsels might have prevailed; while the first generals chosen by the people of Jerusalem all belonged to the official aristocracy (*B.J.* II. xx. 4). At the time of the Passion the ruling class and the public opinion of Jerusalem overcame the Galileans; at the time of the rebellion they failed to do so.

46. The incidents of Mk ii. 18, 23, iii. 1, vii. 2, show that the general population of Galilee did not recognize the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law as binding. On the other hand the multitude, which heard Our Lord gladly in His controversy with the Scribes in the Temple (Mk xii. 38), can hardly have been composed simply of Galileans, and there must have been many in Jerusalem who welcomed such teaching as that of Lk. xi. 46 (=Mt. xxiii. 4). The episode of Lk. xiii. 10 *seqq.* apparently describes an incident in the attempt of the Pharisees to impose their view on the general public, and *v.* 17 shows that there was plenty of enthusiasm for any effective opposition.

It is probable indeed that there was more laxity in Galilee than elsewhere, since the Pharisees and Scribes from Jerusalem in Mk vii. 1 *seqq.* are apparently intended to reinforce the local Pharisees and impress on the Galilean followers of Our Lord the necessity of a stricter observance of the Law. To the Pharisee the general standard of observance as practised by the ordinary Jew was worthless (Jno. vii. 49, Gal. ii. 14, v. 3, Jas ii. 10, and cf. 4 Macc. v. 19, *Pirke Aboth* ii. 1 and *Tr. Berakhoth Tos.* iv. 1 for the principle involved). None the less these followers of the less rigorous interpretation of the Law were proud of their zeal for its observance (Acts x. 14, 28, and cf. below, c. VI. § ii. nn. 35, 37). The attempt of the Pharisees to impose their interpretation on others was an intolerable burden (Lk. xi. 46, quoted above, and Acts xv. 10), but the written Law was accepted with pride and defended with fanatical devotion.

47. Although later rabbinical literature regards the ordinary observers of the Law (the *am-haarez*) as unclean (*G.J.V.* II. 472), yet it is clear from the Gospels that the Pharisees, while blaming Our Lord for His laxity in the matter (Mk ii. 14 *seqq.*), did not refuse all connection or intercourse with them. Thus in Mk vii. 2 they appear to be eating with Our Lord and His disciples in spite of the laxity of the latter in regard to the washing of their hands, and the general failure to comply with the Pharisaic system of tradition, which has led to their breach with Our Lord; cf. also their temporary alliance with the Herodians in iii. 6. It would appear therefore that in fact the exclusive theories of the Pharisees broke down in practice quite apart from Christianity. Consequently it was possible for the Pharisee convert to mix freely with the ordinary Jewish Christian without losing his position as a Pharisee in the eyes of other Pharisees. It is further possible that Schürer (*loc. cit.*) over-estimates the extent to which the Pharisees of the period carried their exclusiveness. The Gospels only represent them as complaining that Our Lord mixes with notorious sinners, and that His disciples do not observe the Law with proper strictness; we have no evidence that they habitually separated themselves from all who were not Pharisees or held that He should have done so.

48. The number of Jews and proselytes who had returned from foreign lands to live in Jerusalem must have been considerable. Acts vi. 9 represents them as

possessing at least two synagogues and probably five. (It is not quite clear whether *τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερτίνων καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων* is intended to describe one synagogue with this title or three. Grammatically, if the reading be correct, the phrase should refer to one synagogue; but in any case the words *τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας* refer to a different group of people who are presumably a separately organized body.) For the view that we have five synagogues cf. *G.J.V.* II. 502, and cf. *ib.* p. 87 and Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, on this passage for rabbinical traditions of a synagogue of Alexandrines in Jerusalem. In any case the language of S. Luke can hardly be accurate, if the words are intended to refer to one synagogue; it is scarcely possible that it should have been called "the synagogue of the Libertines and Cyreneans and Alexandrines"; some shorter name would be used to describe it.

From the fact that the Hellenists form a considerable element in the Church in Acts vi, while the main body of Hellenists remains unconverted (Acts ix. 29), it is clear that we are dealing with a fairly large class of people. Besides the countries represented in the synagogues which attack S. Stephen (the "Libertines" representing Jews from Rome, cf. c. VI. § iv. n. 4), we have three allusions to Jews from Cyprus (Acts iv. 36, xi. 20, xxi. 16), and a proselyte from Antioch (vi. 5). It may be assumed from their comparative proximity that both Cyprus and Syria would furnish a considerable number of Hellenists. To these may be added the countries enumerated in the account of Pentecost, if the word *κατοικοῦντες* can be pressed in its strict sense of "resident in," which is perhaps doubtful.

49. Descriptions of the vices of the heathen are a commonplace of Jewish literature of the period preceding and contemporary with the N.T. Cf. Wisd. xiv. 23 *seqq.*, *Test. Jud.* xxiii, *Napht.* iv. 1, *Jub.* i. 9, iii. 31, xxii. 16, *Pss. Sol.* viii. 14, *Or. Sib.* iii. 590 *seqq.*, 762 *seqq.*, v. 162 *seqq.*, 386 *seqq.*, *Ps. Arist.* 152, *c. Apion.* ii. 24, Mishna, *'Aboda Zara* ii. 1–3, Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* 7, 8 (M. II. 306), *De Concup.* 2 (M. II. 349). Thus in Ro. i. 18 *seqq.* S. Paul adapts a line of argument familiar to his Jewish readers; his innovation lies in c. ii, where he denies their right to regard the familiar line of thought as any reason for self-satisfaction. The lists of sins which he inserts in this passage and xiii. 13, Gal. v. 19, 1 Cor. vi. 9, Eph. v. 3 *seqq.*, Col. iii. 5 *seqq.*, are in the same way amplified versions of the vices which the propagandist literature and preaching of the Jews of the Dispersion alleged against the heathen. (Cf. specially the second passage in Philo referred to above for S. Paul's fuller catalogues, although at this point, as he is not ostensibly writing against the Gentiles, but expounding the tenth commandment, idolatry is omitted.) Naturally such catalogues are also frequent in other early Christian writers. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 3, Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15, *Ep. Barn.* xx, *Hermas, M.* vi, *Didache* v. 1.

50. In general only the most devout Jews of the Dispersion would leave their countries to return to Palestine, though in a few cases such a return might be due to external circumstances, not to religious motives. Among the less devout Jews of the Dispersion more or less complete apostasy was by no means unknown. Apart from the well-known case of Tiberius Alexander (cf. c. v. § iii. n. 8), we read of others in 3 Macc. i. 3, *Antt.* XVIII. iii. 5 and *B.J.* VII. iii. 3. It is clear from Philo's polemics against such Jews in *De Conf. Ling.* 2 (M. I. 404), *De Mon.* i. 7 (M. II. 220) that they were numerous enough at Alexandria to call for serious opposition; and it is possible that the polemic of the opening chapters of Wisdom is directed against such Jews. (See Charles' introduction to this book in *Apocr. and Pseud.* I. 523, and note on Wisd. i. 1.) For the danger at an earlier period see the Book of Tobit, and cf. *Apocr. and Pseud.* I. 186 *seqq.* Cf. also Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 141.

Apart from such complete apostasy we have fairly numerous cases of Jews who failed to live up to the moral standard of the Law. This is implied in Ro. ii. 17 *seqq.*, in which S. Paul appeals to the experience of the Jews in Rome to prove his point that the mere knowledge of the Law had failed to produce in the Jews a standard of righteousness which gave them the right to judge the heathen. In one instance his charges are confirmed by Josephus (*Antt.* XVIII. iii. 5, cf. c. VI. § iv. n. 21). It can hardly be supposed that Aliturus, the favourite actor of Nero (*Vita* 3), conformed to any sort of standard of Judaism in spite of his willingness to help his fellow-countrymen. (For the attitude of the Jews to the theatre cf. Mishna, *'Aboda Zara*, in the *Cambridge Texts and Studies*, VIII. 2, Excursus 3.)

We find grave laxity as to the observance of the Law in Acts xvi. 3, where the marriage of Timothy's mother to a Gentile is entirely contrary to Deut. vii. 3 and *Jub.* xxx. 7–17, while Josephus in *Antt.* xx. vii. 2 describes a similar marriage, that of Drusilla to Felix, as παραβῆναι τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα. It is particularly remarkable that Timothy was not circumcised, especially if the account of his upbringing in 2 Tim. iii. 15 be genuine. See further n. 58.

It is obvious that the warnings against taking part in the vices of the Gentiles referred to in the preceding note were by no means unnecessary for the Jews of the Dispersion.

51. This is essentially the attitude of later Jewish writers towards the Gentiles (*Jub.* xxiii. 29 *seqq.*, *Ass. Moys.* x. 7–10, 2 Bar. lxxxii. 3 *seqq.*, 4 Esdr. xiii. 28 *seqq.*, all contemplate their complete destruction, while 2 Bar. lxxii. 2–5 and *Pss. Sol.* xvii. 32 allow some of them to escape the final judgment, but only as servants of the Chosen People, whose glory will be enhanced by their escape). This view of course has a wide measure of authority in the O.T., and it would seem that it tended to prevail in periods of oppression by the Gentiles. Of the books quoted all except *Jubilees* reflect actual times of oppression, the *Psalms of Solomon* dating from the period which witnessed the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey, while *Ass. Moys.* remembers the oppressions of Herod the Great and Varus (§ vi). Baruch and Esdras date from the period which preceded and followed the fall of Jerusalem.

There is of course a more enlightened strain of Palestinian Judaism (cf. n. 57), but these books when read in the light of the history of the period may be presumed to reflect the general tendency of public opinion. In 1 Enoch the teaching as to the future of the Gentiles varies; thus in xci. 9 it is clear that they are to be utterly destroyed. This passage is regarded by Charles as the work of a Pharisee, written when his party was being oppressed by the later Maccabean rulers and the Sadducees (either 95–79 or 70–64 B.C., cf. *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 171). In any case the devout Jew is being oppressed by those who sympathise with the Gentiles; on the other hand in xci. 14, by a different author, they are to be converted and saved.

52. The belief that the establishment of the Messianic kingdom depends on the observance of the Law or repentance for failure to do so is an obvious deduction from such passages as Deut. xxx. (Naturally the corporate observance of the Law by the whole nation or national repentance is required.) The only steps necessary for such a deduction are the interpretation of the Deuteronomic blessings as the Messianic kingdom and the identification of righteousness with the Pharisaic view of observing the Law. We find it clearly expressed in *Jub.* xxiii. 26 *seqq.* and *Test. Dan.* vi. 4. οἶδεν γὰρ (ὁ ἐχθρὸς) ὅτι ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιστρέψει Ἰσραήλ, συντελεσθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ ἐχθροῦ.

Similarly in *De Execr.* 8, 9 (M. II. 435) Philo makes the restoration of the Jews of the Dispersion depend on their return to the national faith. The external observance of the Law is not so strongly emphasized in Philo, but it is clearly implied. In later rabbinical literature the view is expressed with complete frankness, cf. *Ass. Moys.* i. 18 and Charles' note in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 415 and *G.J.V.* II. 620. Elsewhere the coming of the kingdom depends on the fulfilling of a fore-ordained number of the righteous (1 En. xlvii. 4, 4 Esdr. iv. 36). One or the other of these views has made its way into the teaching of S. Peter in Acts iii. 19, repentance having superseded the idea of legal righteousness. The latter view appears in Rev. vi. 11.

53. This is the basis on which the Law is defended by Jewish apologists, whether as a means of answering heathen critics or as a means of winning Gentile converts. Naturally it would only be accepted by the more enlightened or by those in frequent contact with the Gentiles. In many cases the Jews of the Dispersion lived more or less by themselves and had no feelings for the Gentiles but contempt and hatred similar to those of the Palestinian Jew. (See below, c. VI. § i. nn. 6, 7.)

The most complete defence of Judaism on such a basis as that described in the text is of course that of Philo, who presents the whole of the Pentateuch as an allegory of the most advanced speculations of Greek philosophy. Josephus, although of Palestinian origin, represents the same attitude; the later years of his life were passed in Rome at the court of the Flavian Emperors, and his outlook on life is in general as Hellenistic as that of Philo. (Cf. especially the prologue to *Antt.*,

which is apparently modelled on the opening chapters of the latter's *De Mundi Opificio*, his treatment of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes as schools of philosophy (see esp. *B.J.* II. viii. 2), and his comparison of Moses to the famous law-givers of classical antiquity in *c. Apion.* ii. 15.) It may fairly be assumed that the work in which he proposed to explain the beliefs of his nation as to the nature of God and the meaning of the Law, promised in the closing words of *Antt.*, would have been an allegorical justification of it similar in character to that of Philo, though on a smaller scale (it was to be a work in four books). Cf. *Antt.* I. x. 5, III. vi. 6, xi. 2, IV. viii. 4, in which he promises to explain the reasons for circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath, the distinction of clean and unclean meats, and the laws common to Jewish and other systems. Of these explanations the last was obviously needed to explain how, if Moses was directly inspired by God, others had made the same laws as he did. The distinction of meats was clearly a well-known difficulty to those who sought to defend the Law to the Gentiles, and is explained elaborately by the Pseudo-Aristeas (128 *seqq.*). This work is a fair specimen of the ordinary method of explaining the Law to the heathen in the less elaborate and more popular style. The other two points which Josephus promises to explain were of course things which particularly needed to be justified, since they were obligations which proselytes had to accept and were peculiarly repugnant to Gentile ideas. (See below, n. 58, and for the Sabbath cf. Tac. *Hist.* v. 4, Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 105 and Mayor's note *ad loc.*, *G.J.V.* III. 154.) S. Paul is of course familiar with this method (see below, c. IV. § i. nn. 16 *seqq.*) and uses it freely.

54. Philo, *De Migr. Abr.* 16 (M. I. 450), complains of Jews who only find a symbolical value in the Law, and therefore neglect its external observance. These are not the apostates from Judaism whom he attacks in the passages referred to in n. 50, as is clear from the respect with which he treats them. Philo replies to the argument that the Law is only of value on account of its symbolical inculcation of righteousness that such an argument would apply to men living in isolation or to disembodied spirits. But so long as we are in the body, we must practise the external observance, which is, so to speak, the body of which the spiritual meaning is the soul. By this external observance we shall enable our souls to grasp more clearly the spiritual truths which it symbolizes. [The same point of view underlies Ro. vii. 14, where however S. Paul uses it to prove the impossibility of observing the Law. The Law may be spiritual, but apart from Christianity, man, being σάρκινος and not πνευματικός, has no power to keep it.] How far the Jews of the Dispersion in general tended to the view combated by Philo in the passage referred to, and claimed the right to neglect the letter, while trying to live up to the spirit, is unknown; probably it was not widely held, since it is only mentioned once.

55. See references in n. 53. In Wisd. xi–xvi the fortunes of the Israelites as against those of the Egyptians are proved to be the result of the true knowledge of God, given them by Wisdom; this knowledge in xvi. 6, 11, is identified with the Law. Cf. also such a work as 4 Macc. in which the observance of the Law is shown to be the means by which the heroes of Judaism attained to a degree of virtue exceeding the ideals of Stoicism.

56. Jer. xxxi. 31 *seqq.*, a passage which should be contrasted with Ezekiel xi. 19, xxxvi. 25 *seqq.*; in the former a new Law is to be put in the hearts of the people, while in the latter they are to be given a new heart with which to obey the old Law. Such a belief could easily be inferred from the doctrine that sin was to cease in the Messianic kingdom (cf. 1 En. xci. 8, 14, xcii. 5, *Test. Lev.* xviii. 9), since the disappearance of sin would carry with it the abolition of any need for the Law. Strictly speaking indeed it is hard to see how the Law could cease before the Final Consummation, but it is hardly likely that the distinction between the two was very clearly apprehended by the ordinary Jew of the Dispersion or even of Palestine. That the view of the ultimate cessation of the Law was held is shown by the rabbinical authorities quoted in *Life and Times*, II. 764 (App. xiv), though later Judaism rejects the idea (Hamburger, *R.E.* II. Suppl. 51 *seqq.*, Art. "Fortdauer des Gesetzes"). That there was a popular belief that the Messiah would promulgate a new Law, or abrogate the old, is apparently implied in Jno. iv. 25, while Mt. v. 18 denies such a possibility until the Final Consummation.

57. This belief was indeed characteristic of the best elements among the Hebrews. It appears in Is. xlix. 6 and lx, where however the Gentiles are regarded as the servants of Israel. It is prominent in the *Testt. XII. Patr.* (*Lev.* iv. 4, xiii. 4, xiv. 4, xviii. 9, *Jud.* xxiv. 6, *Dan.* vi. 7, *Napht.* viii. 3, 4, *Asher* vii. 3, *Benj.* ix. 2, x. 5, etc.). This book, although Palestinian in origin, dates from the older Pharisaism, which at the time was enjoying a period of peace and prosperity under John Hyrcanus, and had no reason for bitterness against the Gentiles. It survived in Palestinian Judaism, even in the times of oppression, but only in a few circles; cf. the sayings of Hillel in *Pirke Aboth* i. 12, Lk. ii. 32 (for this passage cf. below, c. III. § ii. n. 35). In general however the tone of Jewish writers in Palestine during the first century A.D. and the period which follows is bitterly hostile to the Gentiles (cf. n. 51). It is equally true that we find a tendency among the Jews of the Dispersion to regard the Gentiles as hated oppressors to be destroyed or punished with subjugation to the Jews at the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. This view even appears in Philo, *De Execr.* 9 (M. II. 435), a passage in which his Messianic enthusiasm and memories of the anti-Semitic outbursts which were frequent at Alexandria lead him into a somewhat literal acceptance of Deut. xxx. 7. Similarly in *De Sept.* 8, 9 (M. II. 284, 285), and *De Carit.* 6 (M. II. 388), he limits the "brethren" of the Jew, from whom the Law forbids him to take usury, to the Jewish nation. But in all these cases Philo is limited by the material with which the O.T. has provided him. His appeal is to the world in general, whether Jew or Gentile (cf. *De Vit. Moys.* ii, M. II. 134 *seqq.*); though naturally since his task is to prove that the Law is the highest expression of the truths of philosophy, the Gentile who accepted his teaching could only do so by becoming a proselyte of Judaism. For his attitude to these cf. *De Carit.* 12 (M. II. 392). Thus his ultimate object is the proselytism of the Gentiles, who are in his general scheme regarded not as enemies, but as ignorant and misguided men, whom it is the Jew's duty to bring to the truth, not to hate as being of a different race (*op. cit.* 19, M. II. 400). This is of course the typical attitude of the Jew of the Dispersion as described in Ro. ii. 17 *seqq.*; cf. Wisd. xviii. 4.

The strongest instance of this zeal for the conversion of the Gentiles is afforded by the Jewish portions of the Sibylline oracles, though the convention under which their compilers worked necessitates the laying of greater emphasis on the folly of idolatry, the one true Temple and the Messianic kingdom than on the details of the Law. For the position which the writers assign to the Gentiles in the Messianic kingdom, *i.e.* to those Gentiles who accept the position of proselytes, cf. esp. *Or. Sib.* iii. 710 *seqq.*, 772 *seqq.*, iv. 162 *seqq.* (but see the next note), v. 420 *seqq.*

Naturally it is not intended that the Jews of Palestine were not anxious to secure proselytes or that the desire was confined in general to the Hellenists. But it seems clear that in the main the Hebrews looked forward either to the destruction or subjugation of the Gentiles by the Messiah, while the Hellenists were primarily anxious to secure adherents among their Gentile neighbours. The difference is less one of theology than one of emphasis.

58. In general the requirements imposed on proselytes in the synagogues were far less than those required of the Palestinian Jew or the devout Jew living among the Gentiles. From the point of view of the Pharisees the proselyte was indeed in exactly the same position as the born Jew, and the evidence is that in fact the Pharisees endeavoured to exact the strictest observance from their converts (Mt. xxiii. 15, Gal. v. 3). For a full discussion of the actual practice of the period cf. *G.J.V.* III. 150 *seqq.* The observance of the Sabbath and the distinction between clean and unclean meats were required of all adherents of Judaism, while in the case of the full proselyte circumcision was required. There were indeed other requirements, but it was these which were the main obstacle to the conversion of the Gentiles, the last-named being naturally the most serious. Hence it became more or less a test question, as the N.T. controversy on the matter shows. Cf. *B.J.* II. xvii. 10, where the Roman officer Metilius, in command of the garrison in Jerusalem, escapes from the massacre of his men by promising μέχρι περιτομῆς ἰουδαΐσειν. Cf. also the conversion of Izates in *Antt.* xx. ii. 4. Here the Jew Ananias, fearing for his own safety if the subjects of Izates learn that the king has

been circumcised at the persuasion of a Jew, informs him that it is possible τὸ θεῖον σέβειν without being circumcised. Later another Jew, Eleazar, informs Izates that it is useless for him to attempt to serve God without circumcision. Ananias, it may be observed, is a Jewish merchant, Eleazar a Pharisee from Galilee. The passage is sometimes quoted as evidence that there were Jews of the Dispersion who did not insist on the circumcision of proselytes. This is however an error. Clearly Ananias, in fear for his own safety, thinks it wiser to leave Izates as a loosely attached adherent, rather than to allow him to become a proselyte. It may be observed that Josephus uses the same word, σέβειν, as that used by S. Luke for these adherents who had not accepted full proselytism. In *Or. Sib.* iv. 165 we have an invitation to the Gentiles to embrace Judaism, in which no mention is made of anything but the ceremonial washing also required of proselytes. It is however possible (if the passage is Jewish and not a Christian insertion) either that this was imposed on the looser adherents, or that the writer endeavours to attract the Gentiles by exaggerating the easiness of the terms of their admission. That circumcision impressed the Gentile mind as the final stage in embracing Judaism is clear from Juvenal (*Sat.* xiv. 99). The Roman repugnance to the practice is shown by the prohibition of it under Hadrian, a prohibition repealed by Antoninus Pius in the case of born Jews, but retained as regards Gentile proselytes. Cf. Mayor's note on Juvenal, *loc. cit.*, and *G.J.V.* I. 674, III. 118.

59. We have no literature which specifically represents the point of view of the Hellenist Jews of Jerusalem who rejected Christianity. On the other hand their zeal for the Law is demonstrated by their opposition to S. Stephen and S. Paul (Acts vi. 11 *seqq.*, and ix. 29), and by the obvious fact that they would normally have no motive for returning to Palestine but devotion to the national religion. That they still retained their zeal for the conversion of the Gentiles seems indicated by the fact that the movement for their evangelization is entirely the work of Hellenist Christians. Thus although we have no information to show that S. Stephen advocated a direct appeal to the Gentiles, the necessity of doing so was clearly implied in his teaching (see below, c. II. n. 10); while his colleague S. Philip has no hesitation in preaching to Samaritans. Apart from S. Paul and S. Barnabas we have also the Cypriot and Cyrenean converts of Acts xi. 20 and the Antiochene teachers of xiii. 1, of whom Symeon bears the Gentile name of Niger, while Manaen through his connection with the court of Herod represents a strongly Hellenized element of Judaism (Lucius is presumably one of the original Cyrenean evangelists of Antioch). Silas in virtue of his Gentile name of Silvanus would seem to have been of this class, as do Andronicus and Junias of Ro. xvi. 7. (Since they were senior to S. Paul in the date of their conversion they were presumably among the early Hellenist converts of Jerusalem.) It would seem therefore that the Hellenists in Jerusalem retained the zeal of the Jews of the Dispersion for the conversion of the Gentiles, though apart from Christianity they would naturally be zealous for their conversion to the Law, and probably to a stricter standard of legal observance than that generally prevalent among proselytes of the Dispersion.

60. Jas i. 25, ii. 8, Mt. v. 17–vi. 18.

61. Cf. above, n. 53. Naturally the Christian Hellenist would not simply argue that the Law, being a hindrance to the conversion of the Gentiles, must be abolished. But the past experience of the difficulty which it presented, however much it might be refined by allegorical interpretation, would predispose him to accept with readiness any argument that would enable him to abandon it, more especially when his zeal for conversion was quickened by contact with Christianity. Cf. Gal. i. 10, where S. Paul's reply to the charge that he persuades men must refer to the criticism of his Jewish opponents that he abolishes the Law in order to gain favour among his Gentile hearers. Cf. also iv. 17, Eph. ii. 13 *seqq.*, Col. ii. 14; in the two last passages S. Paul, being free from controversy with judaizing Christians, has no need to state his theological reasons for regarding the Law as obsolete, and gives clear expression to his underlying view of it. See further c. IV. § i for S. Paul's view on this point.

62. For the belief that the Law would cease at the establishment of the Messianic kingdom cf. above, n. 56. The belief that the establishment of the Church was the

beginning of the final age which was to precede the last judgment is clearly implied in the view that the present is the "last time," which appears in Acts ii. 17, 40, iii. 21, 2 Tim. iii. 1, Heb. i. 2, x. 37, Jas v. 3, 1 Pet. i. 20, iv. 5, 7, 1 Jno. ii. 18. The conception of the last days in Jewish apocalyptic varies from the hope of a temporary Messianic kingdom of complete felicity to one of trouble and distress resembling the apocalyptic passages in the Synoptic Gospels. For the latter conception cf. 4 Esdr. viii. 50, while the conception of the temporary Messianic kingdom on earth almost invariably includes a preliminary period of tribulation. In Christian apocalyptic writers, except for Rev. xx, the temporary kingdom in which the righteous enjoy a period of felicity has disappeared, and the present has become a time of suffering preceding the end. It is natural that the view of Our Lord as the suffering servant, rather than the victorious earthly ruler, should suggest a corresponding change of view as to the last times. The view that the appearance of Our Lord on earth was the beginning of a period of final tribulation before the end was quite compatible with such Jewish ideas as those expressed in 4 Esdr. xiii. 25 *seqq.* or *Ass. Moys.* ix, x.

That the last times were to witness an outpouring of the spirit of God is foretold not only in the prophecy of Joel quoted by S. Peter at Pentecost, but also in Zech. xii. 10. The conception of the gift of the Spirit as a new power which superseded the Law was indeed foreign to Judaism, as represented by apocalyptic literature. This view is however hinted at in Philo, *De Migr. Abr.* 16 (M. i. 450). Here we have the admission that the belief that the Law had only a symbolical value, and need not be observed in the letter, would be reasonable for men living in isolation or if men were *ἀσώματοι ψυχαί* (see n. 54).

This admission is not very far removed from the fundamental Pauline belief that the Christian revelation is the beginning of a new dispensation in which the flesh has been replaced, for the Christian at least, by the Spirit. (Cf. especially Gal. iv. 1 *seqq.*, and the eschatological implications of the phrase *ὅτε ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*, for the conception of Christianity as a new dispensation, and Ro. viii for the conception of the replacing of the flesh by the Spirit.) For a fuller discussion of S. Paul's teaching on this point see c. iv. § i.

63. For the appearance in Wisdom of the two ultimately inconsistent views of a temporal Messianic kingdom and immortality after death cf. *Apocr. and Pseud.* i. 529. We find a similar inconsistency in Philo. *De Execr.* 9 (M. ii. 435) contains a purely conventional forecast of the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, which is in fact quite alien to his belief that the soul is rewarded at death according to its works. Cf. *De Sacr. Ab. et Cain.* 2, 3 (M. i. 164), *De Vit. Moys.* iii. 39 (M. ii. 179), *De Carit.* 4 (M. ii. 387). (The retention by these authors of the temporal kingdom for the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked is due to the fact that the conception was embedded in the O.T. material in which they were working, and to the triumph of national feeling and temperament over their philosophical systems.)

64. Ro. viii. 23, 2 Cor. v. 1 *seqq.*, and for the latter passage cf. Philo, *De Carit.* 4 (M. ii. 387).

65. It is impossible to say how far the considerations suggested above were explicitly grasped by the early Hellenist Christians. It is possible that the movement in favour of preaching to the Gentiles a Christianity divorced from the Law began in a mere instinctive recognition of its necessity, and that S. Paul's arguments are only thought out in order to justify a step to which he was irrevocably committed. Nor have we any specimen of Hellenist teaching before S. Paul with the exception of the speech of S. Stephen, and it is impossible to say how far his peculiar theology was shared by his followers. It is possible that S. Paul's attitude to the O.T. was more in accordance with the traditions of Jewish orthodoxy than that originally preached at Antioch; but it is perhaps more likely that S. Stephen's speech in the Acts represents rather the extremes to which he was driven by persecution than the general Hellenist attitude. Although the speech does not allude to the Gentiles, the action of his followers at Antioch was only the logical conclusion of his teaching (c. ii. nn. 10 and 24 *seqq.*).

66. This is of course the attitude of S. Paul and the writer of Hebrews (c. viii). See c. iv. § i. n. 36.

67. This is the argument of S. Stephen in Acts vii. 48 based on Is. lxvi. 1 and the author of *Ep. Barn.* (ii, iii), a book which is the logical conclusion from the teaching of S. Stephen. Cf. c. II. nn. 24 *seqq.*

68. As for instance in Mk ii. 21, 27, vii. 6 *seqq.* Cf. Jno. iv. 21.

69. It is not clear whether the ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς of Acts viii. 2 are Hebrew Christians whose known piety in the observance of the Law enables them to appear in safety in spite of the persecution, or orthodox Jews with Christian sympathies, but not actually Christians. In any case however there must at any moment have been a fringe of Jewish sympathisers whom it was desirable to conciliate, and who would thus influence the Church in favour of a conservative and conciliatory policy towards orthodox Judaism. (The word εὐλαβής here clearly refers to piety in respect of the Law, since it is their reputation for it which enables them to show their sympathy for S. Stephen. Cf. Acts ii. 5 and xxii. 12.)

APPENDIX I

PRIMITIVE CHRISTOLOGY

THERE is too little evidence as to the beliefs of the first Christians as to the personality of Our Lord, to allow the formation of any very clear conception of the exact beliefs of the first disciples immediately after the Resurrection. The difficulty is increased by the fact that the only direct account of the primitive community comes through the narrative of the Acts and is therefore liable to the suspicion of Pauline influences.

There are, however, certain points which we can quite clearly fix as being independent of such influence. The first of these is the fact of the Resurrection of Our Lord. A series of appearances to living people, who can be called on to give evidence, terminating in a quite unmistakable manner, is the basis of Pauline Christianity; and this is something which he has received from those who were Christians before him. The vision of his conversion was a genuine vision of the risen Christ; but it was unique in its character, since it was given after the series of Resurrection visions proper was closed. The evidence of 1 Cor. xv. 4 *seqq.* on this point is of the greatest importance. S. Paul has to admit that there was something about the date of his vision which made it unique (ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι). It would have been very much more convenient for him if he could have ignored the point, since in fact it told against his claim to be regarded as an Apostle. He has to prove that in spite of the irregularity his vision at the time of his conversion is a genuine claim to the Apostolate, and as such ranks with the visions of an earlier time vouchsafed to others, not merely a vision such as many Christians of his day had seen. (It can hardly be doubted that supposed visions of Our Lord were fairly common among the first Christians.)

The death of Our Lord is regarded by non-Pauline Christianity as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah liii. This implies that Our Lord is the Righteous Servant of God, Whose death is the atonement for the sins of many, *i.e.* of all who by baptism enter the society of His followers, and receive the gift of the Spirit. (Cf. c. 1. n. 23.) This is a point of primary importance. It implies that Christianity had before S. Paul's conversion a doctrine of the atonement, based on a terminology which S. Paul himself did not care to use. To the fact of Our Lord's Resurrection must be added the belief that His death is the atonement for the sins of others.

Our Lord is also the Son of Man. This title in view of its use in 1 Enoch lxii. 7 and similar passages carries with it a definite implication of pre-existence, until the appointed time of His revelation to the world. Our Lord by using it of Himself in connection with His Passion (as in Mk viii. 31) definitely identifies Himself with the Messiah, who will one day appear in glory. The view that there are really two uses of the phrase

implied in the Gospels, one analogous to its use in 4 Esdr. of a human Messiah who is to usher in the temporary Messianic kingdom, and the other of a divine being who is to usher in the Final Consummation in 1 Enoch and that Our Lord referred to Himself as the Son of Man only in the former sense and that the use of the phrase in the second sense referred to a Son of Man of the Enochic type, whose coming Our Lord anticipated, hardly needs serious discussion. In any case, however, it is clear that Hebrew Christianity has quite independently of Pauline influences identified Our Lord in His character of the suffering servant with the Messianic Son of Man who is, in the Enochic literature, to be revealed at the end of the age in glory. That this identification is the work of Hellenic Christianity is, in view of S. Paul's failure to make use of the phrase, quite untenable. (For evidence that the conception of the "Son of Man" (*Barnasha*) as the redeemer, who was to appear to save mankind by the proclamation of the true knowledge of God, descending himself into the sphere of matter in order to do so, was familiar at the time to Oriental religious conceptions, cf. Reitzenstein, *Erlösungsmysterium*; it must be remembered that 1 Enoch and 4 Esdr. are only fragments of Jewish apocalyptic literature, and that their conception of the Son of Man like that of Daniel is very far removed from that of Ezekiel. Jewish ideas in this sphere have been profoundly affected by non-Jewish theologies.) Of all these conceptions it is safe to say that they are non-Pauline and also non-Hellenistic; there is no trace of them in the carefully constructed speech of S. Stephen. The only conclusion is that they are part of the primitive deposit of Hebrew Christianity, from which also the Lucan account of the birth of Our Lord is drawn (c. III. § ii. n. 35).

From this point of view it is fairly clear that, whatever Our Lord's own teaching about Himself may have been, the main presuppositions of Christian theology as to His person belong to an element in primitive Christianity which is entirely non-Pauline. S. Paul has only developed the conceptions already current in the Church of a pre-existing being of a super-human order, whose death is the means by which mankind may obtain forgiveness for sin, His Resurrection being the means by which it obtains both present deliverance and the promise of a personal Resurrection at the Final Consummation. That such a being should be described as κύριος was only natural. The title was commonly employed of the deified monarchs with whom Hellenistic thought was familiar (cf. especially Judith ii. 5, vi. 4). It is significant that the first use of the word in the Acts as applied to Our Lord is in Acts x. 36, where it is inserted in a rather clumsy parenthesis in the mouth of S. Peter. It is to be found in the purely Hebrew Epistle of S. James (ii. 1). The manner in which it occurs in Acts x. 36 suggests that S. Luke is aware that the use of the term was a develop-

ment of Christian practice, which was not entirely acceptable to certain elements of Hebrew Christianity, and that he wishes to point out that its use is not due to S. Paul; it is easy to see that the word in view of its associations might cause some difficulty. In any case however Our Lord is quite independently of S. Paul a being of a super-human and super-angelic order (cf. the relations of the Son of Man to the angels in 1 Enoch), Whose mission has resulted in the forgiveness of sin and the opportunity to obtain a share in the final establishment of the Messianic kingdom. S. Paul's Christology only carries on this conception in the direction to which it was committed quite independently of him.

APPENDIX II

SPIRITUAL GIFTS

A general investigation of the psychological processes underlying the "spiritual" phenomena recorded in the N.T. falls outside the scope of this work. The whole subject is discussed in *E.E.P.* 204 *seqq.* For modern parallels cf. Thouless, *Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*, pp. 154 *seqq.*

The question of the extent to which the witnesses of such phenomena were correct in ascribing them to divine inspiration is not one which can be discussed with profit, since no investigation of the psychological mechanism involved can decide whether the origin of these manifestations was simply the unconscious mind of the speaker, or some external spiritual agency. Nor are we here concerned with the influence exercised by these manifestations on the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

The power known as "speaking with tongues" appears for the first time on the day of Pentecost. Unfortunately the narrative of the Acts at this point has been obscured by the informant from whom the story is derived. This informant is a Palestinian Jew, for whom the world centres round Jerusalem; consequently he presents us with a list of twelve countries with the names of which he is familiar, and regarded as comprising the whole known world. To these twelve (*i.e.* one for each of the Twelve disciples present on the occasion) Rome has been added by the author of Acts as the scene of S. Paul's activities; either he himself or an early and not very intelligent copyist has added "Cretes and Arabians" on the strength of Gal. i. 17 and the Epistle to Titus, in order to make a complete list of countries referred to in the N.T. It might seem remarkable that no reference is made to Macedonia and Achaia, nor yet to Syria. It is, however, to be noted that Ἰουδαίαν in Acts ii. 9 is in any case unintelligible; and it may perhaps be conjectured that the original text was Ἰονίαν, the Greek form of the O.T. Javan, intended to cover the whole of the Hellenic world.

In any case, however, the account presents further difficulties. The hearers are represented as devout Jews of the Dispersion dwelling in Jerusalem. None the less they hear the Twelve speaking apparently in the different languages of the countries in which they were born.

In point of fact, however, the native languages of these countries, even if in certain cases they still survived, would linger only in remote rural districts, and would normally be unintelligible to the Jews who resided in the cities. The languages intelligible to the audience on the day of Pentecost would be limited in all probability to Greek, Latin and the Eastern and Western dialects of Aramaic; it is probable that all of them would have been able to understand Greek.

Thus the narrative as it stands is liable to serious objections. Nor is the conception of orderly speech in different languages consistent with the accusation of drunkenness in *vv.* 13 and 15. On the other hand the latter detail is suggestive. It is one which might well remain in the memory of one who was present on the occasion. In any case it is clear that the impression of drunkenness was one which might easily be conveyed to a stranger who was present at an outburst of "speaking with tongues" in the form in which these manifestations were understood in the Pauline communities (1 Cor. xiv. 23). Consequently it seems not unreasonable to suppose that in fact the manifestation of the day of Pentecost was similar in character to those which meet us elsewhere in the primitive Church. The supposition is confirmed by the resemblance between the N.T. phenomena and those described in 1 Sam. x. 10 and xix. 23, from which it would appear that this kind of manifestation was not unknown to the Jewish religion. It would seem however that it had fallen into discredit at this time, since Jno. vii. 39 definitely expresses the belief of a certain circle which limited the genuine manifestation of these gifts to the period following the day of Pentecost. It is to be supposed that they had shared the general discredit into which prophecy had at this time fallen (see below).

From the evidence of 1 Cor. it is possible to reconstruct a fairly complete picture of the nature of the class of phenomena described under the title of "speaking with tongues." The speaker himself is in a state of trance or ecstasy, during which he contemplates celestial mysteries. At the same time he utters sounds, which are normally unintelligible to his hearers (xiv. 2 *seqq.*). At the same time, in some cases at least, isolated phrases are sometimes intelligible (xii. 3, where the words κύριος Ἰησοῦς and ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς are ejaculations which occur, or may occur, in the course of such an utterance and serve as a guide to enable the hearers to judge whether the source of inspiration is divine or diabolical. Cf. for a similar test of such utterances 1 Jno. iv. 2, 3). In some cases the utterances as a whole can be interpreted; thus in xiv. 5 S. Paul seems to contemplate

the possibility of the interpretation being given by the speaker himself, presumably out of his memories of the visions seen during his ecstasy, while in xii. 10 he seems to contemplate the possibility that in some cases at least the power to interpret tongues may be given to a different person from the speaker. In the latter case it may be supposed that the interpreter is able to piece together from the ejaculations of the speaker a more or less coherent utterance.

In dealing with the phenomenon at Corinth it is necessary to remember that the use of "tongues" has been practised with so little regard to the decencies of public worship that it has become a positive danger to the life of the community. Consequently S. Paul puts it last in his list of spiritual gifts (xii. 10), and useless to the Church in general unless the speaker is able to give an interpretation of his ecstasies (xiv. 6 *seqq.*). On the other hand, in 1 Thess. v. 19, 20, where there has been a tendency to ignore or suppress spiritual manifestations, he pleads for its due consideration and places it before prophecy.

The latter gift, although S. Paul speaks of it as something entirely distinct from speaking with tongues, would seem in fact to differ rather in the degree of intelligibility attending the utterances of the prophet than in anything else. In 1 Cor. xiv. 32 S. Paul lays down as a general rule that the "spirits of prophets are subject to the prophets," apparently meaning that the prophet should retain his normal self-control, but that in some cases at Corinth the prophets did not do so. Naturally at Corinth it would be convenient for an ambitious Christian to claim to give vent to a prophecy on the strength of having been carried away by a sudden revelation, a practice which seems to have been common here (*vv.* 29–32). It is to be inferred that the general aim of the Corinthians was to work themselves into a state of ecstasy, in which they gave vent to uncontrolled utterances, whether articulate or inarticulate, the former being regarded as prophecies, the latter as speaking with tongues; in such cases the line of demarcation between the two classes of phenomena would not be very definite. However much deliberate fraud there may have been at Corinth there is no reason for supposing that a good deal of the excess of which S. Paul complains was not due rather to the deliberate attempt to foster an excessive enthusiasm than to actual imitation.

Thus while S. Paul on this occasion demands that prophecy shall always be delivered by a speaker who retains full control over his normal faculties, it may be doubted whether this was necessarily regarded as a rule by the Church at this period. In Acts xxi. 11 the symbolical action of Agabus and the opening words of his warning τάδε λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον suggest an ecstatic condition similar to that of the O.T. prophets on whom his action is based (Jer. xxvii, xxviii).

The *Didache* (xi. 7) seems to expect prophets to speak in a state of ecstasy, while the account of the Montanist prophecies given by Apollinarius in *H.E.* v. 16 suggests a form of speech which is sometimes incoherent and sometimes not (πνευματοφορηθῆναί τε καὶ αἰφνιδίως ἐν κατοχῇ τινὶ καὶ παρεκστάσει γενόμενον ἐνθουσιᾷν, ἄρξασθαί τε λαλεῖν καὶ ξενοφωνεῖν παρὰ τὸ κατὰ παράδοσιν καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἄνωθεν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔθος δῆθεν προφητεύοντα). It is probable that the Montanists in fact followed fairly closely the fashions of the Apostolic period, their fault lying in their attempt to persist in prophecy after it had ceased to be of value and to use it as a means of obtaining fresh revelations rather than in any actual difference in the forms which their prophecies took. A curious instance of a prophecy of this kind is given in the vision of Kenaz in *Bibl. Antt.* xxix. In this vision Kenaz while in a trance gives an account of the creation, but afterwards remembers nothing of it; he is only able to say *Si sic est requies iustorum postea quam defuncti fuerint, oportet eos mori corruptibili saeculo ut non videant peccata.* It would appear that he has been contemplating celestial mysteries during his trance while describing something entirely different. Thus his utterance may be regarded as prophecy in so far as it is articulate and more or less coherent, or as speaking with tongues in so far as it does not conform to the rule of 1 Cor. xiv. 32. If the date assigned to this document by Schürer and James is correct, it would seem that the idea of the possibility of such phenomena was familiar to the Jews of the first century A.D., even though in practice they were discredited, so far as official Judaism was concerned.

The reasons for this discredit are easy to understand. The older Jewish prophets had devoted themselves partly to the prediction of the future of the Chosen People, partly to the task of enlightening them as to the true religious and moral implications of the worship of Jahweh. Naturally in most cases the former depended on the extent to which the people accepted the latter. By this period however the teaching of the Pharisees as to the absolute perfection of the Law left no room for the latter function of prophecy. The duty of the devout Israelite was simply to observe the Law, and to extend its dominion over the various departments of human life. In this respect there was little scope for prophecy, which was in practice confined, so far as its moral side was concerned, to the production of apocalyptic writings attributed to the worthies of the O.T. (cf. for this point Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, II. viii). There was indeed a certain disposition in some Pharisaic circles to accept the Baptist as a prophet (*Antt.* xviii. v. 2), but it is perhaps doubtful whether this would have stood the test of time. In popular Judaism however the expectation of a prophet survived (cf. Mk vi. 14 *seqq.*, viii. 27 *seqq.*, and the popular welcome of the Baptist).

In the same way the function of the Old Testament prophets in regard to the prediction of future events had developed into the production of apocalyptic writings in which the great names of Jewish history were represented as foretelling the events of the writer's own time. The general object of this side of apocalyptic writing is to console the readers for their present sufferings by pointing out that they are the beginning of the final sufferings of the Chosen People which are to usher in their final triumph. The distinction between prophets and apocalyptic writers was not known to the popular Judaism of the time, since it depends only on the fact that certain books were included in the Hebrew Canon, while others were not. Popular Judaism and primitive Christianity regarded the book of Enoch as "prophecy" no less than the writings included in the Canon (Jude 14). This was due to the fact that these works were regarded at least by the uneducated as emanating from the writers whose names they bore; but at the same time although the official leaders of Judaism refused to recognize the possibility of a fresh prophet, except as a matter of theory (cf. Charles, *loc. cit.*), oral prophecy of an apocalyptic kind flourished among the less educated Jews. Thus Josephus ascribes to the Essenes a power of prediction which is rarely proved false (*B.J.* II. viii. 12), and explains that it is based on their study of the Old Testament. This can hardly mean anything but that they were in the practice of producing apocalyptic utterances based on the writings of the O.T. and similar to the apocalyptic literature which we possess. Their prophecies would no doubt be mainly concerned with the interpretation of current events as signs of the coming end, and share the general vagueness of all apocalyptic writing which enables it to claim fulfilment by the course of events, however they may turn out. For the currency of prophecy of this kind at the period cf. also *B.J.* IV. vi. 3 and VI. v. Its employment by Messianic impostors (cf. nn. 10 and 18) no doubt increased its unpopularity with the ruling classes.

Thus prophecy, though discredited by the Pharisees, continued in respect in the eyes of popular Judaism, and passed thence into Christianity. Occasionally among the Christians as among the Jews there would be specific predictions of future events. These however would usually form part of a general warning of the imminence of the end of all things; thus the warning of Agabus as to the famine (Acts xi. 28) would seem to be drawn from a prophecy of the tribulations foreshadowed by the attempt of Caligula to set up his statue in the Temple (cf. c. v. § ii. n. 6). A similar prophecy is recorded in *H.E.* iii. 5, where the χρησμὸς τοῖς αὐτόθι δοκίμοις δι' ἀποκαλύψεως ἐκδοθείς is either a warning similar to that of Agabus or an interpretation of the utterance of Our Lord recorded in Mk xiii. 14. The warning of Agabus recorded in Acts xxi. 10 is more strictly a prediction of future events, though it was not very difficult to foresee the dangers which

awaited S. Paul in Jerusalem. Naturally the Jews of the time believed in the possibility of such predictions (cf. *Antt.* XIII. x. 7, XV. x. 5, XVII. xiii. 3), but they are not the normal function of prophecy. (It would appear from *Hermas*, *M.* xi, that there was a tendency for prophets to exploit their powers in this direction for their private advantage, but this was definitely regarded as an abuse.)

Normally then Christian prophecy seems to follow the lines of the apocalyptic writings which have survived to us from the Judaism of the period and the oral prophecies which were current among the less educated Jews of Palestine. It combines the moral and religious function inherited by such writers from the older prophets with their habit of identifying current events with the signs of the coming end of all things; while naturally it is not dominated, as were the Jewish writers, by the conception of the supremacy and finality of the Law. The supreme instance of prophecy in the N.T. is of course the Apocalypse (described as a prophecy in i. 3), while other examples may be found in Acts ii. 16 *seqq.*, 1 Cor. xv. 51 *seqq.*, 1 Thess. iv. 13 *seqq.*, 2, i. 6–ii. 12 and Jas v. 1–9. It is however clear from 1 Cor. and elsewhere that oral prophecy played a large part in the public worship of the Church; no doubt, like the instances referred to, it varied in its contents between predictions of the end which had no particular reference to the conduct and belief of the Christian and solemn warnings to Christian holiness, based on the assumption that the end was imminent. (It may be noted that in 1 Cor. xiv. 6 S. Paul might seem to distinguish between "apocalypse" or revelation and "prophecy." This however cannot be maintained, since in *v.* 30 it is assumed that a revelation is a necessary condition of the power to prophesy at all. It would seem that we have here not four possible ways in which S. Paul might benefit his converts but two, namely teaching, with the necessary internal qualification of knowledge, and prophecy, with the necessary internal qualification of a revelation vouchsafed to the prophet.)

The extent to which these "spiritual" gifts were current among the Christians of the Apostolic period is somewhat difficult to determine. Clearly prophecy, although fairly widespread, was always an exceptional gift, which marked out those who were able to exercise it habitually as persons of considerable importance. Apart from the day of Pentecost we have four instances of speaking with tongues in the Acts. In iv. 23 we have apparently an attempt by S. Luke to describe a typical scene in the life of the Church, in which the enthusiasm of those present results in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the whole community, or on all those present when the Apostles are released. It seems probable that the hopeless confusion of the text is due in the first instance to the fact that S. Luke was attempting to reproduce the somewhat incoherent language of Christian

enthusiasm; no doubt the confusion has been increased by well-meant attempts to improve the text. In the other three cases in which it is mentioned it has an evidential value (Acts viii. 15, where it proves that the Samaritans are capable of admission to the Church, x. 44 and xi. 15 *seqq.*, where it justifies the baptism of Cornelius, and xix. 6, where it proves the superiority of Christian baptism to the Johannine). In general it is used as evidence of the authority of the Apostles (Acts ii. 16, where it proves that they are the appointed instruments for the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, and cf. Gal. iii. 5, 1 Thess. i. 5, 1 Cor. ii. 4; in all these cases it supplies a manifest ratification of S. Paul's claims). On the other hand in 1 Cor. xiv. 22 S. Paul regards it as being of more value for the edification of the faithful than for the conversion of unbelievers; but it is possible that this is due to his desire to moderate the exaggerated importance attached to it by the Corinthians. It would seem from the other Pauline passages that the manifestation of the Holy Ghost was one of the reasons for which his converts were persuaded to accept his teaching; in all three cases it is classed with miracles of other kinds.

It is possible that at the outset it was expected that the descent of the Holy Ghost would accompany the laying-on of hands after Baptism as a general rule; this might be indicated by the fact that its manifestation is a deciding point in the three controversial cases in which it is referred to in the Acts, since, unless it was expected as a matter of course, the fact that no manifestation occurred could not be taken as being in any way decisive on the point at issue. On the other hand it is possible that it was only exceptional, and therefore all the more striking in these disputed cases.

CHAPTER II

STEPHEN AND SAUL

THE first serious internal difficulty of the new sect of Judaism arose from its attempt to combine the functions of a religious movement and a social organization. The growth of numbers and the waning of the first flush of enthusiasm were bound to lead inevitably to the development of a more natural and less enthusiastic atmosphere, in which grievances and dissensions could make themselves felt. Naturally the attempt to preserve a complete equality of possessions among all the members multiplied the opportunities for grievances[1]. Moreover the Christian body was not a homogeneous whole. The Hellenist Jews of Jerusalem were marked off from their Hebrew brethren by the fact that they possessed synagogues of their own, in which, as in the synagogues of the Dispersion, worship was conducted in the Greek tongue; many Hellenists spoke no other language. They were thus to a considerable extent cut off from their Hebrew brethren[2], who naturally tended to look down on those who had been born in strange lands. The Jews of the Dispersion were suspected, not without some justification, of laxity in the observance of the Law; and in any case the mere fact of the Hellenists' return to Palestine was a confession of their inferiority to the native Hebrew[3]. Among them too were proselytes, who were admittedly inferior to the seed of Abraham[4].

It was therefore easy for the Hellenist Christian to feel himself slighted by his Hebrew brethren, whether a slight were intended or not. Complaints arose that in the daily administration of the bounty of the Church to its helpless dependents, the former were neglected. Hitherto the task of administering the common funds had been left to the Twelve. In a society of any considerable size the task would be difficult to combine with their religious duties; it would become impossible, if it were to include the examination and redress of the grievances of the dependents of the Church. Accordingly it was agreed that a commission of seven should be appointed from among the Hellenists to secure the interests of their members against intentional or unintentional neglect[5].

Although originally appointed purely as administrative officers the seven Hellenists soon asserted themselves in other spheres. The qualities which had rendered them the leaders of the discontented elements in the Church also rendered them effective missionaries to the public at large; while the fact that they were recognized as holding

an official position in it gave them an authority to proclaim its doctrines greater than that of the private Christian[6].

The lead in this respect was taken by one Stephen. His personal gifts marked him out as the chief of the group, and his rise to a position of recognized prominence brought with it a fresh outburst of activity in the preaching of the Gospel. His labours were even accompanied by manifestations of a miraculous character, and as one already marked out by his possession of spiritual gifts he seemed to the outsider little less impressive than the Apostles. His appeal however was made to a different element of the public, since by a natural impulse he directed his efforts to the Hellenist synagogues, leaving the Hebrews to the older leaders[7]. By the latter indeed considerable progress was made, the lower classes of the priesthood, under the influence both of their official grievances and of their disapproval of the lack of genuine religion among the more exalted orders of the hierarchy, furnishing a considerable number of recruits to the new teaching[8].

Progress of this kind however would hardly have caused any great excitement among the members of the Sanhedrin. The Pharisees had decided that the Church could be allowed to face the test of time and either prove its permanent value or die a natural death. Nor would the Sadducees take any particular interest in the conversion of members of the lower classes of the priesthood. But the rise of the Hellenist group to a prominent, if not predominant, position in the Church, did not merely bring with it a new lease of energy, or enable the Church to appeal effectually to circles which it had hitherto been unable to reach. The new leader was by no means content, as the older leaders had been, to regard the Christian system as a completion of the old, which filled up certain points in it, which had previously been incomplete, but left the main body of it unaffected. It was indeed the fulfilment of the old system, but, in fulfilling, it had abolished the old encumbrances, which had hitherto prevented the one true revelation of God from obtaining the allegiance, not merely of the Jewish nation, but of the whole world. The fatal obstacle to the propagation of Judaism had been the necessity of imposing on proselytes the literal observance of the Law[9]. Stephen was filled with zeal to proclaim to all the world the necessity of faith and repentance as the means of salvation in the day when Jesus would appear to judge mankind. To preach these with any hope of success it was necessary to preach the Gospel without the encumbrance of the Law; and he hoped to fire the Hellenist synagogues with his own

enthusiasm. Consequently he proceeded to preach in them the imminence of the coming of Jesus. At the same time he emphasized the fact that at that coming there would be no further need of Law or Temple, with the obvious implication that there was no need for imposing these details of the old system on the Gentile world[10].

Not unnaturally his doctrines excited fierce opposition. With little distortion, and perhaps with none at all, he could be accused of teaching that the new revelation had abolished the whole system of the Law and the worship of the Temple. None the less Stephen proved himself in controversy more than the equal of his opponents. Unable to defeat him in argument they appealed to the general public for support in suppressing his blasphemous innovations. The material for a nationalist and religious riot was always at hand in Jerusalem, and the Hellenists knew how to kindle it. The mere allegation that he was preaching the coming abolition by Jesus of the Temple and the Law was enough to excite not only the patriotic fury of the mob, but also the fanatical zeal of the Pharisees for the preservation and extension of the supremacy of the Law. Stephen was seized and dragged before the Sanhedrin on a charge of blasphemy[11]. The accusations made against him could not fail to unite both parties in that body. The Pharisees could not tolerate the belief that the Law, which they had made the centre of their whole existence, was merely a temporary and local set of rules, which was shortly to be abolished; while the Sadducees were equally unable to view with equanimity the doctrine that the Temple, on which the whole political existence of the nation and their own position and prestige depended, was not a necessary part of the worship of the one true God. The whole Sanhedrin was bound to unite to put down the new teaching[12].

The moment for repression was singularly favourable. So long as Pontius Pilate remained in office as procurator, it would have been practically impossible to secure his assent to a death-sentence pronounced on purely religious grounds, even though it had the support of the whole Sanhedrin; and no other charge could be produced with any show of plausibility[13]. But by these later months of the year 35 A.D. the situation had changed[14]. A Messianic impostor had recently arisen in Samaria, who promised to lead his fellow-countrymen to Mount Gerizim and there to discover the sacred vessels hidden by Moses. The assembling of a large body of Samaritans, however peaceable their intentions, might easily lead to armed collisions with the inhabitants of the neighbouring districts of Judaea; and thus his official duties, to say nothing of the prospects

of treasure, made the presence of Pilate on the spot, with a sufficient body of troops, both natural and necessary. He had accordingly advanced into Samaria with the greater part of the force at his disposal. On his arrival he had without warning proceeded to disperse the multitudes by force of arms and executed the ringleaders[15]. In doing so he had displayed a quite indefensible measure of violence, and the authorities of the Samaritan nation appealed against his barbarity to Vitellius, the legate of Syria, who at the moment, in view of the possibility of a Parthian campaign, held supreme command over all the adjacent provinces[16]. The appeal was successful, and Pilate was suspended from his office and ordered to return to Rome and answer for his irregularities to the Emperor. His place was taken by Marcellus, an officer of Vitellius' staff, pending the appointment by Tiberius of a regular procurator[17], but even this temporary settlement was not fully effected till the Passover of the year 36.

Meanwhile Galilee, in the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas, had also been the scene of serious disturbances. The matrimonial irregularities of that monarch had involved him in a quarrel with his neighbour Aretas, king of the Nabatean Arabs, whose daughter he had divorced in favour of Herodias. Her father had for several years been content to leave the affront unavenged, until the occasion of a frontier-dispute with Herod, and the strained relations between the Roman and Parthian Empires, offered him an opportunity[18]. He was no friend to Rome and the moment seemed favourable for displaying his independence by an attack on a subject-ruler of the Empire[19]. He inflicted a considerable defeat on Herod at Gamala, and in the confusion of the moment succeeded in occupying the important city of Damascus[20]. His success was by no means unpopular among the Jews, who regarded the defeat of Herod as a punishment for the murder of John the Baptist[21].

Thus towards the end of the year 35 Roman authority in Judaea and Galilee was in abeyance, and might even seem to be on the verge of collapse. Pending the arrival of Marcellus in Jerusalem Caiaphas could hardly ignore the danger of a violent outburst of nationalist fanaticism, such as the accusations of the Hellenists against Stephen might easily provoke, unless he took steps to vindicate the dignity of the Temple and the Law[22]. Even had he desired to do so, it might well have been dangerous to refuse to inflict on Stephen the death-penalty which the Mosaic code inflicted on those guilty of blasphemy. In fact however he had from the outset taken the lead in the attempt

to suppress the new movement, and had been mainly responsible for the judicial murder of its Founder. The latest attack on the religious system at the head of which he stood could only serve to stimulate his hatred of Christianity; and he had a golden opportunity for gratifying that hatred, if the accusation could be proved.

Consequently, however he might attempt to explain away the unorthodox elements of his teaching, Stephen had little prospect of acquittal. In any case indeed he had no intention of resorting to such methods to save his life. It was his duty to expound the true interpretation of the old system, as revealed by the light of the new dispensation, before the supreme council of the nation. That they would listen to the truth was unthinkable, but they must be given the opportunity either of accepting or rejecting it. His defence to the charge of his accusers was thus simply a full and undisguised statement of his teaching which made no attempt to harmonize itself with the traditional beliefs and practices of Jerusalem[23].

His doctrines, thus boldly stated, were revolutionary. The devotion of the nation to the soil of the promised land, the Law and the Temple, had from the first been an ignorant preference of the literal and material to the spiritual[24]. Their error had not indeed been shared by the patriarchs, the Saints of the old covenant, whose children they were proud to call themselves. The first promises had been made to Abraham while he dwelt in Mesopotamia; in the land itself he had never possessed a foot of soil[25]. He was indeed promised that his seed should own it, and the rite of circumcision had been instituted as a pledge of the fulfilment of that promise; but so far was circumcision from conveying any special virtue that within three generations of its institution the twelve patriarchs of the nation were ready to sell their brother Joseph into Egypt[26]. And it was Joseph, the rejected of his brethren and an exile in a foreign land, who found favour in the sight of God, and was exalted by Pharaoh to a position in which it became possible for him to be the saviour of the nation —but only at the cost of their removal from Canaan into the land of Egypt[27]. It was here that Jacob died; and after his death he was buried, not in the Holy Land, but in the country of the hated and despised Samaritans[28]. When later the people were oppressed in Egypt, their deliverer Moses was one who had been cast out by his parents and brought up for his future greatness in the house of Pharaoh[29]. On his first attempt to assist his brethren he was again rejected and fled to the land of Midian[30]. It was here, and not in the land of promise, that God revealed Himself to His servant, and com-

manded him to deliver the people from their bondage, as a type of the Redeemer who was to come after[31]. In the accomplishment of his task he brought the people to Sinai, and it was there (again not in Judaea) that the angel spoke to him and to the rest of the nation[32]. But the first Law, the living oracles of God, was rejected by the people, when they set up the golden calf[33]. This was the beginning of that idolatry which culminated in the captivity in Babylon[34]. None the less the Israelites were given a second imperfect Law and a tabernacle as a token that they were God's chosen people; and it was with the tabernacle only and not the Temple that they were able to conquer the land and drive out the heathen[35]. David, the final conqueror of the land, desired to provide a permanent place of worship for the people, but was not allowed to do so. It was left to Solomon, his degenerate son, to build a Temple[36], and thereby to commit the nation to the supposition that the God Who made the world could live in a Temple made with hands—a belief which, as Isaiah had seen, was as ludicrous as the belief of the heathen that God could resemble images, the work of man's hands[37].

At this point the implication to which Stephen's speech was leading became obvious to his hearers. In reply to their cries of protest[38], he broke off into an impassioned denunciation of them and their fathers. Both alike had resisted the Holy Ghost, and the murder of Jesus was but the climax of the persecution and murder of the prophets of old—the natural action of the children of those who had received the Law at the hands of angels and had immediately rejected it[39]. Amid the growing uproar Stephen turned his eyes from his hearers and looking up to heaven proclaimed that he saw the heavens opened above him and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. This was enough for the Sanhedrin[40]. With due observance of the law as to blasphemy Stephen was seized, dragged outside the city and stoned to death. A leading part in the affair was taken by a young Pharisee named Saul[41], a pupil of Gamaliel, whose opposition had some few years before led to the end of the persecution of the Church. Saul was already a prominent member of the Pharisaic party, and his share in the present proceedings committed them fully to the change of policy.

This was not the only disaster that befell the Church. The opportunity for completing the extirpation of Christianity might not last for many weeks, but while it lasted, it could be utilized to the full. Most of the leading exponents of the new development of Christianity received warning of the impending danger and escaped from the

city. The Twelve remained in hiding, refusing to desert their posts; for the Church had no existence outside the city, and could not be deserted for the sake of personal safety. Moreover they were not personally known to the members of the Hellenist synagogues, who were most concerned in the persecution (Saul himself was Hellenist by origin, although educated at Jerusalem), and could hope to remain unrecognized. The bulk of the Hellenist converts were however forced to flee, if they could do so. Those who could not were exposed to a domiciliary visitation, conducted by Saul, in which all who were identified as Christians were arrested and carried off to prison until they consented to abjure their errors. Since no more of the recognized leaders could be arrested, it was not considered wise to inflict the death-penalty on the less important Christians; it was always possible that an account of the whole matter would be demanded by the Imperial authorities.

Of the Hebrew Christians apart from the Apostles, some were protected by their known piety in the observance of the Law, and others by their personal insignificance, from the full fury of the persecution. None the less the collapse of the organization of the Church was complete; the regular servants of the community could not appear in public, and the burial of Stephen had to be left to those whose piety was above suspicion[42]. Meanwhile those of the Hellenist Christians who had made good their escape withdrew to quarters where they would be safe from the persecution of the agents of the Sanhedrin. Neither Herod Antipas in Galilee nor the local authorities of Samaria were likely to tolerate Saul's activities, while at Caesarea the presence of the Roman garrison and the hatred of the Gentile population made it unsafe for the Jews to indulge in internecine quarrels[43]. Consequently by withdrawing to these regions the Hellenists could be sure of safety; for in Roman Law and in actual fact the High Priest's authority did not extend beyond the limits of the municipal jurisdiction of Jerusalem. Jewish lawyers might claim a wider competence for the Sanhedrin of which he was the head; but in fact it could not be maintained[44]. Some indeed of the Hellenists despaired of the future and decided to forsake the Holy City and to return to their earlier homes among the Jews of the Dispersion; but the majority only withdrew to regions from which they could hope to return shortly[45].

In one direction however Saul's hatred of Christianity could find an outlet, even when Jerusalem could provide no further victims. There was at Damascus a large Jewish colony, and it was quite

possible that some of its members had been infected with the new doctrines, or that some of those who had fled from Jerusalem had sought refuge there[46]. The city had just fallen into the hands of Aretas, who would be only too willing to seize the opportunity of conciliating the authorities of Jerusalem by permitting them to exercise over his new Jewish subjects the jurisdiction, which they claimed in theory, over all Jews throughout the world. The arrest of a few Christians could do him no harm; but in the event of any general disturbance in Syria the friendship of the Sanhedrin might prove of some value, particularly in alienating the subjects of Herod Antipas from their allegiance.

Accordingly after dealing with the Christians of Jerusalem and the immediate neighbourhood, Saul proceeded to Damascus, armed with letters to the synagogues of the city, calling for the surrender of all Christians, in order that they might be brought to trial at Jerusalem. The expedition was suggested by Saul himself, the consent of Aretas being taken for granted[47]. In the unsettled condition of Palestine Saul could hope to make the journey and return with his victims before Roman authority had been re-established in Jerusalem.

His plans had a dramatic ending. The arguments of Stephen were sufficiently in accordance with methods of interpreting the Scriptures with which he was familiar, to exercise a strong influence on him, and the fortitude of the martyr and of the humbler victims of his fury had shown him that the new movement possessed a power which was proof against persecution. He had indeed endeavoured to allay the doubts which he felt by violent attempts to extirpate Christianity; but it was already certain that he had failed. As he approached Damascus he passed through the crisis of his spiritual conflict. He saw on the road before him a blaze of light, stronger than the blaze of the mid-day sun, and fell to the ground blinded by the glory on which he could not look. From the midst of the light he heard a voice reproving him for his attempts to stifle his conscience by destroying the teaching which he knew to be the truth[48]. In his vision the voice proclaimed itself to be that of Jesus of Nazareth, Whom he was persecuting in the person of His followers. He was ordered to proceed to Damascus, and there to wait for further orders which would reveal to him the divine will.

With the assistance of his escort—for the temporary blindness induced by the blaze of the vision remained—Saul proceeded on his journey. At Damascus a Jewish Christian named Ananias, distinguished for his piety in observing the Law, was commanded in a

vision to visit him. Saul had no alternative but to accept his own experience on the way to Damascus as a decisive revelation of the will of God, to abandon his whole attempt to persecute the Church —an attempt which the Christians of the city were awaiting with dread—and to submit to baptism at the hands of Ananias. At his baptism his sight was restored, and he retired from the city to the Nabatean desert, there to consider his future life in the light of the revelation vouchsafed to him, and to adjust to the new truth the old religion of which he had been a prominent exponent[49].

His withdrawal involved the collapse of the persecution[50]. By the Passover of the year 36 A.D. Vitellius had appointed a temporary successor to Pilate and had himself found time to visit Jerusalem[51]. He deposed Caiaphas, after a pontificate of eighteen years, thus reverting to the usual policy of the Roman government of preventing the office from acquiring an undue importance in the eyes of the nation, by changing its holder annually[52]. Pilate indeed had made his own position so weak by his corrupt practices and his outbursts of barbarity, that he had been forced to abandon the normal rule, lest it should lead to an appeal by the Jews to Tiberius[53]; but Vitellius was naturally not exposed to such influences. None the less he found it wise to conciliate the Jews by restoring to the High Priest the custody of his robes of office, which had in the previous régime been kept in the tower of Antonia[54]. Nor did he attempt to break down the influence of the house of Annas, which had for forty years almost monopolized the High Priesthood, since he proceeded to appoint Jonathan son of Annas, and brother-in-law to Caiaphas[55]. In the following year he revisited the city and replaced Jonathan by his brother Theophilus[56].

Although the new High Priests shared the hostility of Caiaphas to the Church, they were no longer able to proceed against it effectively. The actions of Vitellius demonstrated that the Imperial authority was as strong as ever in Jerusalem, and that any illegality would be firmly dealt with by the legate of Syria[57]. The Church in the city was able to return to its normal conditions so far as the Hebrew Christians were concerned. But the teaching of Stephen and the persecution which had followed his death had already produced a complete revolution both in the teaching and in the scope of the new movement.

Hebrew Christianity might think that it was returning to the old state of affairs; but in fact that state of affairs had been finally abolished.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. How far the original system of communism of the Christian Church in Jerusalem survived the very earliest period of its history is perhaps open to doubt. The distribution of daily meals to a community of 5000 people would need a very considerable degree of organizing ability. The task would not be impossible, if they were divided up into several congregations each under the supervision of separate rulers, a method which the organization of the synagogues in large cities would naturally suggest; there are indeed traces of such an organization of different groups of Christians (see c. I. n. 28). Certainly the narrative of Acts iv. 32 *seqq.* suggests that it was still being carried on after the time when the Church numbered more than 5000 members, but the earlier chapters of the book hardly profess to be more than a collection of incidents in the early history of the Church, and cannot be pressed in regard to their chronological order. It is of course possible that the numbers are exaggerated; but see c. I. n. 21. The figures given are by no means impossible as the result of a sudden outburst of enthusiasm in an Oriental holy city, crowded, especially at great festivals, with pilgrims from all parts of the world. The Essenes numbered 4000; but their organization was very elaborate, and it would be far easier to provide for that number, living in scattered village-communities, than for the same number in a single city (*Antt.* XVIII. i. 5 and Philo, *Quod Omn. Prob. Lib.* 12, M. II. 457). On the whole it is probable that while the system of poverty by which the wealthy surrendered their goods for the benefit of the helpless remained, the system of daily common meals disappeared fairly soon, being replaced by weekly meals of a more specifically religious character. This view is to some extent supported by Acts vi. 1, which seems to imply that the daily ministrations are only for the benefit of the widows and other helpless dependents. If all the Church met for them, there seems no reason why the presence of the younger Hellenists should not have been sufficient to protect the widows from neglect.

2. For the fact that the worship of the synagogues of the Dispersion in Europe was normally held in Greek see *G.J.V.* III. 140–142. To the evidence there given may be added the fact that Gentiles would not normally understand Aramaic in these regions, while the services of the synagogue would seldom attract those who could not understand them, not being of the dramatic type, which gains in influence by the fact that the words are not intelligible to the worshippers.

That the use of Greek was retained in Jerusalem can only be conjectured. The conjecture is however supported by the fact that S. Stephen's teaching in Acts vi. 8 *seqq.*, and that of S. Paul in ix. 29, only excite hostility in the Hellenist synagogues, although both are in strong opposition not merely to ordinary Jewish beliefs, but also to those of the Hebrew Christians. This seems to indicate an almost complete isolation of Hellenists and Hebrews in the city, which is rendered intelligible if the Hellenist as a rule spoke in Greek. The same fact is indicated by the complaint as to the Hellenist widows, who would hardly be in danger even of seeming neglect, unless they were easily distinguishable as a class from their Hebrew sisters; and again it is hard to see what the distinguishing mark could be except a difference of language. Naturally the distinction would only affect the less educated Hellenists. The better educated would be bi-lingual, like S. Paul and S. Stephen, and a large number of the Hebrews themselves.

We may also compare Acts xxii. 2, from which it is clear that a Jew who could only speak Greek was by no means uncommon in Jerusalem. Cf. xxvi. 14, where the fact that the voice addresses S. Paul in Aramaic is mentioned to support his claim that his teaching is the true development of orthodox Judaism, and not his own invention, as his early opposition to it shows (*vv.* 4 *seqq.*).

3. See c. I. n. 50, for the laxity of the Jews of the Dispersion. The superiority of the Hebrew over the Hellenist was obviously implied in the fact that the Hellenist thought it worth while to return to Judaea; usually his return must have meant a certain sacrifice, which he would not have made, unless the actual living in the promised land was an advantage of the greatest importance. Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 22, Phil. iii. 5, and for S. Paul's exact claim to use the title see below, c. IV. § i. n. 3; in the strict sense it was a somewhat doubtful one.

4. *G.J.V.* III. 186 *seqq.* For proselytes resident in Jerusalem cf. Acts vi. 5 and *Antt.* XX. ii. 5, *B.J.* V. iv. 1 (Helena of Adiabene and her son Monobazus), Tobit i. 8 (Sinaitic text), which indicates that at the time when this book was written (about 200 B.C., according to *Apocr. and Pseud.* I. 185) there were proselytes residing at Jerusalem, whom it was an act of piety for the faithful to support.

5. From the fact that the Seven all bear Greek names, one of them being a proselyte from Antioch, it seems clear that they must be supposed to be representatives of the Hellenist section of the community, not of the whole society. The only alternative would be to suppose that they were appointed to supervise the whole administration of relief to the helpless members of the Church, the choice of Hellenists being due to the desire of the Hebrews to demonstrate their disinterestedness in the matter. It is however more probable that they are simply appointed to safeguard the interests of Hellenist widows.

6. This explanation of the career of S. Stephen and S. Philip can only be regarded as conjectural. The narrative of Acts clearly represents the Seven as being appointed for administrative duties, while in fact S. Stephen proceeds to gain a great reputation as a preacher. S. Philip preaches as soon as driven from Jerusalem, and later is recognized as an "evangelist" (Acts xxi. 8). Both of them display the miraculous gifts, which elsewhere are regarded as the marks of Apostles (vi. 8 and viii. 6, 7; cf. v. 12, 1 Cor. ix. 1 and 2, xii. 12, and Appendix on the Apostolate). The case of S. Philip is complicated by the fact that the tradition preserved by Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 31) confuses him with the Apostle of the same name, but apparently the confusion is due to the fact that at a later period S. Philip "the Deacon" was recognized as an Apostle. Similarly Nicolas the proselyte of Antioch according to Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* III. iv. 25) appears as a teacher of an advanced Hellenist, if not antinomian, type. Of the rest of the Seven we know nothing; and it is somewhat striking that wherever we have any information it should always represent the Seven as teachers and not as officers for the supervision of the needs of the widows.

The explanation in the text is however all that the evidence warrants. It is quite reasonable to suppose that the persons chosen by the Hellenists were those who were naturally qualified to be their leaders and spokesmen, and that the subsequent career of S. Stephen as a teacher should be due to the fact that as a recognized officer of the Church he was regarded in the Hellenist synagogues as its authorized representative. In this case it is to be supposed that he found openings for teaching his peculiar doctrines, which he had hitherto lacked, while the career of S. Philip is to be attributed to the fact of the persecution.

On the other hand the appearance of the Hellenists as a body with such a very different theology from that of the Apostles (cf. c. 1. n. 59) suggests the suspicion that in fact there was a considerable feeling among them against the complete acceptance by the Apostles and the Hebrew section of the community of the old Jewish system, and that the Seven were really leaders of a doctrinal revolt as well as the spokesmen of a purely social grievance. Of this indeed there is no evidence; but psychologically it is by no means improbable that a general sense of dissatisfaction was felt among the Hellenists at the absence of any doctrinal progress, which would have come to a head sooner or later, but was precipitated by the question of the widows. In this case the whole controversy within the Church was raised on a comparatively unimportant side-issue, and shelved by the appointment of the Seven; while the death of Stephen and the Dispersion of the Hellenists occurred before the main question could ever be faced by the Church of Jerusalem as a whole. Hence it was never formally raised until the conversion of Cornelius and the long controversy which followed from the time of that incident until the Council of Jerusalem.

This however can only be conjectured; the evidence of the Acts may be defective, but it is quite intelligible as it stands. The full and explicit development of S. Stephen's views may not have taken place until after his appointment.

7. Since S. Stephen's teaching, as recorded, is hardly of a character to appeal to any but Hellenist Jews and since his opponents come from the Hellenist synagogues, it seems reasonable to suppose that he addressed himself exclusively to them. Acts vi. 7 suggests that the reconciliation was followed by a considerable increase in the numbers of the Church, but it is not clear whether the verse is

inserted to cover a fairly lengthy period of development or to denote a sudden outburst of energy. In view however of the revolutionary character of S. Stephen's teaching it seems likely that his career as a teacher was of brief duration, and that the verse is to be interpreted as referring to a sudden outburst of activity. Again, however, it is necessary to remember that his teaching may have been a new development some time after his appointment, and that there may have been an interval of some length between the events of Acts vi. 1–9 and the martyrdom. The view put forward in the text that his appointment, his career as a missionary to the Hellenists and his martyrdom followed close on one another seems probable, but cannot be regarded as certain.

8. For the existence of a class of priests who were opposed on religious grounds to the Sadducean faction among the High Priests cf. the introduction to the "Zadokite fragment" printed in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 785. There were however at a subsequent period causes of quarrel between the upper and lower orders of the hierarchy, in respect to the permission given to the Levites to wear the linen robes which had hitherto been confined to the priests when singing in the Temple, and the seizure by the High Priest of the tithes which belonged to the priesthood as a whole (*Antt.* xx. ix. 2 and 6). There is indeed no direct evidence that the encroachments on the rights of the lower class of priests, which date from some thirty years later, were due to earlier quarrels between them and the chief priests. The seizure of tithes seems due entirely to the rapacity of Ananias the son of Nebedaeus; but the equalization of the Levites with the priests in regard to the wearing of the linen robe is suggestive. Josephus states that the permission was given by Herod Agrippa II with the consent of the Sanhedrin. Since it was contrary to the existing practice and is regarded by Josephus as a breach of the Law which was punished by the destruction of the Temple, it is clear that the consent of the Sanhedrin was obtained by the vote of the Sadducees against that of the Pharisees. (For the tendency of the Sadducees to disregard their old opponents at this period see below, c. v. § ii. n. 18.) From the fact that the Sadducees supported the Levites against the lower priests it seems that there was a quarrel between the two grades of the priesthood at the later period, and it is possible that it existed at the earlier date which we are considering. This however can only be conjectured; and it is possible that the movement was purely religious, and emanated from the "Zadokite" group responsible for the work referred to above. Others of the priests sided with the Pharisees (*Vita* 2, 3 and see below, c. III. § ii. n. 35).

9. For the Law as an obstacle to the conversion of the Gentile see above, c. I. nn. 53 and 61.

10. Since the main motive which led the Hellenist to return to Jerusalem was the desire to participate in the worship of the Temple, it is natural that S. Stephen's views on the abolition of the Law should lead to a discussion of the place of the Temple under the new dispensation.

The exact scope of his teaching before the speech recorded as his answer to his accusers is difficult to understand from the account in Acts vi. 11. The charge is said to be brought by "false" witnesses, and it is to the effect that he has foretold the return of Our Lord, at which the Temple will be destroyed and the Law changed or abolished. If this is accurate, it would seem that the falsehood consists in the suppression of the fact that S. Stephen was only speaking of the return of Our Lord to establish a Messianic kingdom of some unspecified character, and in the implication that He was to make these revolutionary changes within the existing order of the world. But this explanation is full of difficulties. It is clear that S. Stephen might have foretold the abolition of the Law and the Temple by Our Lord in a Messianic kingdom, whether a temporal kingdom on earth or an everlasting kingdom after the final judgment (*i.e.* he might conceivably have uttered apocalyptic accounts of the end similar to Rev. xx or Rev. xxi or a combination of both as given by the writer of the Apocalypse). But it seems impossible that such a view should have been regarded as blasphemous even by the most rigid of Pharisees (cf. c. I. n. 56, and for the destruction of the Temple, 1 En. xc. 28, 2 Bar. xxxii. 2). It is very hard to suppose that it would have raised such opposition in the Hellenist synagogues. But a far greater difficulty is that S. Stephen's speech as recorded is clearly leading up not to eschatological speculations about the position of the Law

and the Temple in the Messianic kingdom, but to the view that the Temple-worship was a false development and that the Law was never intended to be understood as it had been by the Jews (see below in this Chapter).

It is indeed clear that S. Stephen's speech as recorded is an ample justification, not only of the charge brought against S. Stephen by the "false" witnesses, but of a far graver charge, since it amounts to the doctrine that Our Lord has revealed that both the Law and the Temple were from the outset false developments. The description of the witnesses as false is not indeed important, since it is quite likely that a Christian writer should use the word of any witness who gave evidence which was false from the Christian point of view, although it might be perfectly true from his own. The difficulty lies in the fact that S. Stephen, instead of answering any charge as to unorthodox speculations about the Messianic kingdom, which would hardly be regarded as blasphemy, proceeds to expound at length a system which would have justified a much more serious accusation.

It is of course by no means impossible that the charge brought against S. Stephen is inaccurately recorded; but it must be noted that S. Luke could obtain information on the whole incident both from S. Paul and S. Philip, who were personally interested in the whole matter. That S. Stephen's speech conveys an accurate record of his general line of argument seems certain. It is entirely non-Pauline in its view of the O.T. (see below), and there seems no motive for ascribing such views to him, unless they were those that he actually held, though it is of course to be presumed that the speech is a free composition, based on his known views and methods of argument, rather than an actual record of his words, except for a few isolated reminiscences of the scene contributed by eye-witnesses.

The account given in the text implies that S. Stephen did not actually express his full beliefs in the Hellenist synagogues, but only prepared the way for a fuller exposition of them by pointing out the transitory character of the whole Jewish system, as a preparation for a fuller development of them later. Such a development would have included the doctrine that Christianity should be preached to the Gentiles without the Law, since apart from this belief there seems no reason for his endeavour to convert the Hellenist synagogues to a view which was far more radical than that of the Christian body as a whole. In his speech he put forward his views in a fuller and more explicit form than he had hitherto done, knowing that in any case he could not hope for acquittal unless he were prepared to deny them altogether. This view is probable and harmonizes with the evidence; though it remains possible that S. Luke has modified the original charge made against S. Stephen in order to avoid reminding Jewish readers of the lengths to which he went—lengths which the Christian Church has never upheld (cf. nn. 24 *seqq.*).

11. The opposition in Acts vi. 12 begin by exciting a riot among the mob, which is supported by the elders and Scribes. The latter are the Pharisees as in Lk. xxii. 66 (where the Scribes represent the Pharisaic wing of the Sanhedrin, as against the Chief Priests, who represent the Sadducees) and Acts iv. 5 *seqq.*

12. According to later rabbinical views the crime of blasphemy could not be committed without the pronouncing of the sacred Name (*Tr. San. M.* vii. 5). It appears however from Mk xiv. 58 that the words attributed to Our Lord would have been regarded as blasphemy, if they could have been proved. Similarly S. Stephen's prophecy of the abolition of the Temple and the Law was apparently an offence of blasphemy, which, if proved, would have been liable to the death-penalty. It must be remembered that in the excited state of public opinion any insult to the Law or the Temple would arouse the keenest resentment; cf. *Antt.* xx. v. 3 and 4 for incidents which occurred a few years later in which insults to the Temple and the Law nearly precipitated a rebellion. In the latter case Cumanus, the procurator, found it necessary to execute a soldier who had burned a copy of the Law. The Sadducees in any case would not regard the Pharisaic tradition as to the limitation of the offence of blasphemy as binding, even if any such tradition existed at the date, which seems in itself improbable; while they were also inclined to a far greater degree of severity in their punishments than the Pharisees (*Antt.* xx. ix. 1). Thus it seems reasonable to suppose that they would have regarded S. Stephen's teaching as blasphemy and therefore as exposing him to the death-penalty, although in fact the actual sentence was passed on other grounds.

It would probably be unjust to suppose that the Sadducees merely regarded the Temple as a source of prestige and authority. There is no reason to doubt that they regarded the upkeep of the national religion as the necessary means for securing the divine favour on which the well-being of the nation depended. According to their lights their patriotism was probably quite genuine (cf. Jno. xi. 50, and see Appendix to this Chapter), but naturally it is always difficult for the leaders of an established religious body in the case of an attack on their religion to distinguish the extent to which they are animated by zeal to defend the truth from the desire to preserve their own dignity and affluence.

13. Cf. I. n. 16.

14. The outstanding difficulty in the whole episode of the martyrdom of S. Stephen is the fact that he is put to death by the Sanhedrin without the consent of the procurator. It is clear that the Sanhedrin had no power to inflict the death-penalty at the time of the Crucifixion of Our Lord, or they would not have made such efforts to secure the consent of Pilate. On the other hand there is no evidence that the proceedings at the trial of S. Stephen were not perfectly formal; the High Priest presides and the method of execution shows careful regard for the law of blasphemy as laid down in the O.T. (see below, n. 41). Thus the suggestion made by Harnack that S. Stephen met his death in a street-riot is a mere conjecture and stands in complete contradiction to the whole existing evidence. On the other hand it is hard to suppose that any procurator would have passed over the incident without either intervening to effect a rescue or inflicting some punishment afterwards; and certainly if any punishment had been inflicted S. Luke would have recorded it. His desire to prove that the Imperial authorities refused to condemn Christianity and protected it where necessary is too obvious to need demonstration.

The only explanation of the difficulty seems to be that it occurred at a moment when the Imperial authority was, in Jerusalem at least, in a state of abeyance. Such a temporary breakdown seems in fact to have occurred at the beginning of A.D. 36, in view of the events recorded by Josephus. (See text and the following notes.) This seems to be the only possible explanation of the martyrdom of S. Stephen and the failure of the Roman authorities to avenge it.

15. For the incident of the Samaritan impostor cf. *Antt.* XVIII. iv. 1. There is some obscurity about the affair, since the Samaritans are said to have assembled in arms; but after they had been dispersed by Pilate the Samaritan authorities complain to Vitellius that the object of their bearing arms had been not to inaugurate a rebellion against Rome, but to avoid the oppression of Pilate, which the bearing of arms was the surest means of evoking. On the whole it seems probable that the impostor had claimed to be the Messiah and proposed to inaugurate a rebellion on the strength of the treasure, which he may have believed in on the ground of a supposed vision. Apart from a Messianic movement there seems no reason for his collecting an armed multitude to assist in the discovery.

16. Tac. *Ann.* vi. 32. *Cunctis quae apud Orientem parabantur L. Vitellium praefecit.* For his life and character cf. Tac. *Ann. loc. cit.*, Suet. *Vitell.* 2; he was the father of the later Emperor. Normally it appears that the procurator of Judaea was not subject to control by the legate of Syria. Both on this occasion and on the occasion of the appeal of the Samaritans to Ummidius Quadratus against Cumanus in A.D. 52 (*Antt.* XX. vi. 2) the legate of Syria had received special powers over the adjacent province. (Cf. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 54 for the latter incident.) On other occasions on which the legate of Syria intervenes in Judaea, he does so either for a special purpose (as in the case of the census of Quirinius and the proposal to erect a statue of Caligula in the Temple, the execution of which is entrusted to Petronius), or in order to provide the procurator with forces larger than those normally at his disposal in view of some threatened danger. (So in *Antt.* XX. i. 1, and in the case of the intervention of Cestius Gallus to support Florus at the outbreak of the rebellion.) In normal times however the procurator or the Jewish authorities refer matters direct to the Emperor, as in Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 38 (M. II. 590), *Antt.* XX. viii. 9, 11, *Vita* 3. It may be noted that in *Antt.* XX. i. 2 the Imperial decision in the matter of the High Priest's robe is communicated to the Jews and the procurator, although the legate had intervened at an earlier stage, and in *B.J.* II. xvi. 3 it is proposed to appeal to Rome against Florus although the

danger of rebellion had already brought the legate Cestius Gallus to Jerusalem. Naturally in the case of interventions by the legate, he assumed control over the province as being of superior rank to the procurator.

17. *Antt.* XVIII. iv. 2. Pilate's removal from office must have occurred late in A.D. 35 or early in A.D. 36, as Vitellius soon after visits Jerusalem, arriving there for the Passover. This was the Passover of the year 36, as in the year 37 he visited Jerusalem again for a great festival on his way to conduct a punitive expedition against Aretas for his attack on Herod Antipas (*Antt.* XVIII. v. 3 and see below). On the occasion of this latter visit he learnt of the death of Tiberius, which occurred on March 16 of that year. An earlier date than A.D. 36 for the deposition of Pilate is out of the question, since Vitellius only arrived in Syria in the summer of A.D. 35 (Tac. *Ann.* vi. 32), while further Pilate did not reach Rome until after the death of Tiberius. This point presents some difficulty, as Josephus clearly distinguishes between the two visits of Vitellius to Jerusalem, whereas, if Pilate was deposed before the Passover of 36, it is hard to see how he could fail to arrive in Rome before March, 37. It is possible that Vitellius, having deposed him, referred the matter to Tiberius for decision and was ordered to send Pilate to Rome for trial. This corresponds with the procedure of Quadratus in dealing with Cumanus in A.D. 52 according to the version given by Tacitus in *Ann.* xii. 54; and though the narrative is open to suspicion (see below, c. VIII. § ii. n. 2), it seems probable that the procedure implied by which the legate refers the case to the Emperor by letter and receives orders either to send the procurator to Rome, or to deal with it himself, was the normal official method in such matters. In this case the dilatory methods of Tiberius and the closing of the travelling season might well account for the delay in Pilate's arrival at Rome. (Cf. Tac. *Ann.* i. 80, *Antt.* XVIII. vi. 5, for Tiberius' slowness in official matters.)

On the other hand the two visits of Vitellius to Jerusalem cannot fall in the same year. Vitellius could hardly afford time for two such visits, one at the Passover and the other at Pentecost; and as he deposed on the second occasion the High Priest whom he had appointed on the former visit, there must have been at least a year's interval. Vitellius was anxious to conciliate the Jews, and such a proceeding as the deposition of a High Priest within two months would have been highly unpopular (see Appendix to this Chapter). Thus the visits must fall in consecutive years, the former, soon after the deposition of Pilate, at the Passover of 36, the latter at the Passover or Pentecost of 37. If Turner, in Hastings' *D.B.* i. 410, is correct in putting the Passover of 37 on March 20–21, it is clear that the feast coinciding with the second visit was Pentecost and not the Passover, since Tiberius died only on March 16. His death was not officially published till a few days later. In view of the season of the year fifty days seems about the normal length of time which the news would take to reach Syria. (Cf. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 378 *seqq.*, Art. "Roads and travel in N.T.") Thus the news could not reach Jerusalem by the Passover, but would naturally arrive about Pentecost.

18. *Antt.* XVIII. v. 1 ascribes the beginning of the quarrel to Herod's treatment of the daughter of Aretas. As a matter of fact this occurred some ten years before, and it would seem that he waited until the general state of affairs in the East offered him a prospect of avenging the insult without involving himself in a general conflict with the Roman Empire. The frontier-dispute in the district of Gamala, to which Josephus alludes, without giving any details, would seem to have been brought forward as an immediate pretext for the quarrel.

For the situation as between Rome and the Parthian Empire cf. Tac. *Ann.* vi. 31 *seqq.*

19. For the character and career of Aretas and the Nabatean monarchy in general cf. *G.J.V.* i. 726 *seqq.*, and see n. 47 below.

20. That Damascus was in the possession of Aretas and his successors for a considerable period seems clear from the allusion to him in 2 Cor. xi. 32, and from the fact that coins of the city bearing the head of the Roman Emperor are not found between the years 33–34 and 62–63 A.D. That the ethnarch referred to by S. Paul was a resident governor of the city and not merely a ruler of the Nabatean colony in Damascus, similar to the rulers of the Jewish community at Alexandria, seems certain. There is no evidence that the Nabatean Arabs possessed any peculiar

qualities similar to those which made it convenient to treat the Jews in an exceptional manner, and in any case S. Paul could have appealed to the protection of the Roman authorities against an attempt on his life by any such agent of Aretas. The view that the transfer of Damascus from the Roman Empire to the Nabatean monarchs was connected with the aggressive action of Aretas against Herod Antipas is denied by Schürer (*G.J.V. loc. cit.*) on the ground that the Roman Empire would necessarily have punished such an aggression immediately. This is however hardly certain; as a matter of fact Vitellius was on the point of opening a campaign to punish Aretas for his attack on Antipas (and perhaps for other injuries) when he was stopped by the news of the death of Tiberius (*Antt. loc. cit.*). The disgrace into which Antipas fell on the accession of Caligula, and the subsequent madness of that Emperor and the policy of Claudius would account for their failure to follow up the matter, assuming that the city had passed into the hands of Aretas without any disaster to the Roman arms. The point is not of importance, but it is certain, for the reasons given below (n. 47), that the transfer falls before S. Paul's departure from Jerusalem on his mission to persecute the Christians of Damascus, and therefore before the death of Tiberius.

21. *Antt.* XVIII. v. 2. The passage has been rejected by some authorities as a Christian interpolation, but see *G.J.V.* I. 438. To the reasons there given may be added the fact that no Christian interpolator would be likely to ascribe to the Jews in general the belief that the disaster to Herod was a divine vengeance for the murder of the Baptist.

22. Cf. n. 14. Although Caiaphas was deposed shortly after the death of S. Stephen (on the occasion of the visit of Vitellius to Jerusalem at the Passover of A.D. 36), it seems clear from the silence of S. Luke that the deposition was so obviously a part of normal official procedure that it could not even plausibly be regarded as an act of divine vengeance for his share in the martyrdom. In the circumstances of the case Caiaphas could not unreasonably urge that his action was in the absence of the procurator the only means for averting serious disorder. His successor Jonathan was deposed after a pontificate of little over a year, and Theophilus, the successor of Jonathan, after four years, so that even if either of them had been responsible for the execution, it would have been possible to regard their deposition as a punishment, had not such changes been too frequent to attract any attention (see Appendix to this Chapter).

23. See n. 10. Assuming that the accusation against S. Stephen is correctly recorded, it would seem that his speech is a fuller statement of his doctrines and their logical implications than any he had hitherto made. This is presumably to be attributed to the fact that he knew his position to be hopeless and that in consequence it was useless to endeavour to conciliate public opinion by advancing his teaching in a modified form.

24. The whole implication of S. Stephen's speech is that the historical development of Judaism has been entirely false (see the following notes). This view is of course entirely contrary to S. Paul's belief in the Law as the necessary preliminary to the Gospel; the attitude of S. Stephen in primitive Christian literature can only be paralleled in the *Epistle of Barnabas* (cf. esp. iv. 6, ix. 4 *seqq.*, x, xiv. 1–3, xvi). In both we have the belief that the only value of the O.T. lay in its interpretation as a moral allegory, which Philo mentions as existing among the Jews of his time as against the general view that while the Law had an allegorical meaning it must none the less be kept in the letter (c. I. nn. 53, 54). This belief has however been developed by S. Stephen under the influence of Christianity to the logical conclusion that the whole past system of literal observance was from the outset a perversion of the true meaning of the O.T. by which the spiritual truth has been forgotten, not, as in Ro. vii, Gal. iii. 19–iv. 5, a necessary preliminary to the revelation of the full truth. The whole method involves of course a completely arbitrary selection of certain passages in the O.T., and a radically false interpretation of them; it can only be made logical and consistent by the Marcionite doctrine that the God of the O.T. is a different being from the God of the N.T.

25. Acts vii. 2–5. The emphasis lies on the facts that God first appeared in Mesopotamia, even before Abraham had moved thence to Charran, and that even when he ultimately reached Palestine he possessed not a foot of soil in it. Note

the deliberate divergence from Gen. xi. 31. God appears in Mesopotamia in order to remove his first call as far from Palestine as possible (cf. n. 28).

26. *vv.* 6–9[a]. The rite of circumcision, so far from profiting those who received it, allows the twelve patriarchs to be the first to start the practice, since grown habitual with their children, of rejecting those whom God has raised up to deliver them.

27. *vv.* 9[b]–15. The divine assistance which enabled Joseph to be the saviour of the nation was given to him in a strange land, and it only took effect at the cost of the removal of Jacob and his household into Egypt, the traditional home of idolatry in its worst form. (Philo, *De Sept.* 18 (M. II. 292), *Ps. Arist.* 138, *c. Apion.* i. 25, *Or. Sib.* iii. 30, etc.)

28. *vv.* 16, 17. Thus the first fulfilment of the promise of the possession of the land took the form of the acquisition of a grave in Samaritan territory.

The point is made at the cost of a somewhat daring perversion of the O.T. narrative according to which Jacob was buried not in the land which he bought from Hamor at Shechem (Gen. xxxiii. 19), but in the land which Abraham bought from Ephron the Hittite at Hebron (Gen. xxiii, l. 13). Here too according to *Jub.* xlvi. 9 all the patriarchs were buried except Joseph (cf. *Antt.* II. viii. 2). In the *Testaments* Joseph himself is buried at Hebron (*Test. Jos.* xx. 6) in spite of the explicit statement to the contrary in Jos. xxiv. 32. S. Stephen deliberately rejects the current tradition as well as the O.T. narrative in order to enforce his point. [The Samaritan Pentateuch follows the received O.T. text.]

29. *vv.* 18–22. The first rejection of Moses by the people enabled him to learn from the Egyptians the wisdom which qualified him to be their deliverer. For the legendary prowess of Moses among the Egyptians cf. Philo, *De Vit. Moys.* i. 5 *seqq.* (M. II. 83 *seqq.*), *Antt.* II. ix. 7–xi. 1. The speech of S. Stephen at this point implies a whole cycle of non-Scriptural legends.

30. *vv.* 23–29, and cf. *v.* 35. The emphasis on the comparatively unimportant incident of the rejection of Moses after the killing of the Egyptian is due to the obvious implication that the incident is a type of the subsequent rejection of Our Lord.

31. *vv.* 30–34.

32. *vv.* 35–38[a]. Incidentally S. Stephen points out that Moses, the recognized author of the Law, had foretold the coming of a prophet similar to himself, a fact which renders still worse the failure of the people to recognize that prophet when He came.

33. *vv.* 38[b]–41[a]. S. Stephen's point here is complicated by the introduction of a non-canonical element. In the first place the story of the Golden Calf is intended to illustrate by a third instance the persistent rejection of Moses by the people who boasted that they were his followers. But he adds to this the idea that the original Law which was thus rejected was not merely a version of that subsequently given, but a better Law (λόγια ζῶντα, which are the original Law given εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων). Owing to their rejection of this original Law, according to the rabbinical legend which is referred to in Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, commenting on this passage (cf. also his comments on Jno. x. 35), the children of Israel lost the opportunity, which they then had, of being made like angels. S. Stephen alludes to this or a similar tradition, arguing that the sin of the Golden Calf involved the loss of the true Law, which was that broken by Moses, and the handing of the nation over to idolatry (*v.* 42). In the usual style of allegorical interpreters of the O.T., S. Stephen does not feel bound to make any attempt to harmonize this part of his speech with the fact that David is subsequently described as a man after God's own heart, although *ex hypothesi* he knew only a second and inferior Law, *i.e.* a Law of the letter and not of the spirit, given with the tabernacle after the first had been destroyed (see n. 35). In *Bibl. Antt.* xii. 5 the writing vanishes from the tables at the making of the calf, but new ones are given.

For the agency of angels in the giving of the Law cf. *Jub.* i. 27, Philo, *De Decal.* 9 (M. II. 185), Gal. iii. 19.

34. *vv.* 41[b]–43.

35. *vv.* 44, 45. That there was an inferior Law of some kind is left to be understood from the mention of the tabernacle. With this Law, and with only a tabernacle, not a fixed Temple, the people conquered the promised land, a process completed by David, a man after God's own heart.

36. *vv.* 46, 47. So with the reading οἴκῳ, the sense being that David wished to provide a better place of worship than the tabernacle, but only as a place of assembly for the house of Jacob; it was left to Solomon to build a habitation for God, as if He had need of such things. It must however be admitted that αὐτῷ is very harsh, without the previous θεῷ in *v.* 46, although the sense is rendered easier by the fact that the words are a quotation. With the reading θεῷ the sense is that while David desired to build a better σκήνωμα, it was left to Solomon to build a permanent house, and by the glory of it to lead the nation astray from the truth.

37. *vv.* 48, 49. At this point the meaning of the speech is made clear by the quotation from Isaiah. The Temple, as a mere house made with hands, cannot be the dwelling-place of God. In spite of the fact that the doctrine could be supported with a quotation from Isaiah, in view of the public devotion for the Temple it is hardly surprising that S. Stephen was not allowed to continue. For the popular beliefs as to the permanence of the Temple cf. *B.J.* VI. v. 4, *Or. Sib.* v. 402, and for the devotion felt for it *Ps. Arist.* 83 *seqq.*, *B.J.* v. v, VI. x, 2 Bar. x, Philo, *De Mon.* ii. 1 *seqq.* (M. II. 223), *Leg. ad Gaium* 29 (M. II. 573) and *passim*, Mk xiii. 1. It was indeed often held that the Temple would be destroyed at the establishment of the Messianic kingdom or at the Final Consummation, and replaced by a heavenly building (cf. 1 En. xc. 28, Tobit xiv. 5, 4 Esdr. vii. 26, xiii. 36, 2 Bar. xxxii. 2); but this would not reconcile the Jew before the fall of the Temple to prophecies of its destruction, still less its description by S. Stephen as a χειροποίητον. To appreciate the force of this description cf. Acts xvii. 24, where S. Paul in addressing a heathen audience applies it to the temples of the heathen, arguing that just as God does not dwell in temples made with hands, so He cannot be represented by idols, which are equally the work of men's hands. Thus the Temple in S. Stephen is relegated to the position of a χειροποίητον, *i.e.* it is liable, if regarded as the place which God has chosen for His dwelling, to the stock Jewish argument against idolatry. The appreciation of this point by S. Stephen's hearers is the fitting close to the speech. (For the force of χειροποίητος as a description of the Temple and its worship cf. Philo, *De Creat. Princ.* 1 (M. II. 361), where a bad pilot is described as ἐργασόμενος ἐν εὐδίᾳ χειροποίητα ναυάγια, *i.e.* unnecessary or superfluous shipwrecks. The word has practically come to mean "sham" and lost its original force almost completely.)

38. Obviously an interruption is implied at this point, by which the hearers show their implacable hostility.

39. The ending of the speech is remarkable for the vigour of its language. But for the interruption there would presumably have been a summary of later Jewish history on the lines of Lk. xi. 47 *seqq.* For the last clause cf. n. 33.

40. Cf. Mk xiv. 63. In both cases the actual blasphemy, in virtue of which the charge is considered to be proved by the admission of the defendant, is the statement that Our Lord will be or actually is seen standing at the right hand of God. For the rending of the High Priest's clothes in the former case, as the mark that the charge is proved, cf. *Tr. San.* M. vii. 5. In either case however it is fairly clear that the alleged blasphemy of setting Our Lord at the right hand of God was only a pretext for justifying a condemnation which was in any case inevitable (cf. n. 12).

41. S. Luke notes that he is taken outside the city, as is ordered in Lev. xxiv. 13 *seqq.*, cf. 1 Kings xxi. 10, 13, Lk. iv. 29 (where the attempt to throw Our Lord down from the summit of the hill is the proper method of beginning the execution by stoning as described in *Tr. San. M.* vi. 4[a]), Acts xiv. 19 (where if S. Luke is right in describing the order of events the dragging of S. Paul outside the city is presumably intended to make up for the failure to do so before the stoning began). The mention of the fact that the witnesses laid their clothes at the feet of Saul indicates that the whole proceeding was conducted in the regular form, according to which the witnesses began the execution (Deut. xvii. 7), the rest of the people following them. According to the procedure in *Tr. San. loc. cit.*, the first witness precipitates the criminal from a height while the next witness or witnesses stone him. The reference to them here seems to indicate that the proceedings were carried out in accordance with rabbinical teaching on the subject; while the fact that S. Paul assists them seems to show that he took a leading part in the matter.

42. Acts viii. 1 *seqq.* Apparently the motive of the Twelve for remaining is that given in the text (cf. c. 1. n. 2). Of the Hellenists whose flight is reported S.

Philip is clearly a leader, and it may be presumed from the success of the refugees in evangelizing the places through which they pass that they included some persons of considerable capacity and eminence in the Church. This is especially the case with the evangelists of Antioch (see below, c. IV. § i. n. 68 and c. V. § i. n. 13). Since the period when effective persecution was possible would end with the arrival of a successor to Pilate, it can hardly have been a very long one, yet it was sufficient to enable S. Paul to deal with the Christians in Jerusalem and to proceed to search for others at Damascus. On the other hand an attempt to search the whole of Jerusalem for suspected Christians, whether Hellenist or Hebrew, would be a lengthy proceeding. Further the devout men (*i.e.* devout observers of the Jewish Law) are either Christians or at least very strong sympathisers with Christianity; devout Jews in general would probably sympathise with their recognized leaders who were in favour of the execution and the attempted suppression of the Church. On the other hand the young men who would normally have buried S. Stephen (Acts v. 6) apparently cannot appear in public.

From these facts it would seem that the general course of the persecution was that described in the text. The leaders of the Church, including the Twelve and the Seven, would be in danger as recognized leaders, as they were later in the reign of Herod Agrippa I (see below, c. V. § ii). Next to them the main force of the attack was directed against known Hellenist Christians, who were suspected of holding the doctrines of S. Stephen, and were imprisoned until they abjured Christianity. They would normally not have any large number of friends to shelter them, while if, as is probable, many of them could only speak Greek (cf. n. 2), they would be easily recognized. Further they would be known in the Hellenist synagogues, with which S. Paul was familiar. They would thus be an easy prey. On the other hand it would be a very difficult matter to hunt out the obscurer Hebrew Christians, particularly if they numbered several thousands. Such a persecution would also be very unpopular with their friends and relatives in the city, even though the latter did not sympathise with their beliefs. Of the leading Hebrew Christians again some were well known for their Jewish piety (cf. c. I. n. 41 and c. III. § ii. n. 36). It is hard to suppose that S. James the Lord's brother, who was safe in the reign of Herod Agrippa I, could have much to fear from the persecution of S. Paul (cf. c. V. § ii. n. 18). It would appear therefore that the persecution mainly affected the Hellenists and the leaders of the Church who were of Galilean origin or only followers of the popular standards of Judaism, and that it further resulted in the break-up of the normal organization of the Church, but that the more devout or less important Hebrews remained unaffected. Whether there were any other martyrs besides S. Stephen does not appear. It might be inferred from Acts xxvi. 10 that several were so condemned; but from the fact that no names of other martyrs are recorded in the N.T., and from the fact that further executions might lead to difficulties in the event of the restoration of the Imperial authority, it seems more likely that the plural is only used loosely by S. Paul in this passage in order to emphasize the bitterness of his hatred of Christianity.

43. S. Luke accurately represents the refugees as making for the regions where the High Priest's writ did not run, such as Samaria, Galilee, and the province of Syria (xi. 19), while S. Philip after a brief return to Jerusalem in viii. 26 makes for the fringe of Gentile cities in Philistine territory and Caesarea. Of these regions Samaria, though subject to the procurator of Judaea, had a local administration of its own. Its local independence had been restored by Pompey after the capture of Jerusalem in 63 B.C., prior to which it had for a time been subject to the Hasmonean rulers of Judaea (*Antt.* XIV. iv. 4), and its size and importance had been greatly increased by Herod the Great, apparently as a check on the influence of Jerusalem (*Antt.* XV. viii. 5). It was ruled by a council chosen from the local aristocracy (*Antt.* XVIII. iv. 2 Σαμαρέων ἡ βουλή, XX. vi. 2 Σαμαρέων οἱ πρῶτοι). This body in Roman eyes formed the senate of the *municipium* of Sebaste. It was presumably partly Samaritan and partly Gentile in its composition, since the population of the city would seem to have included a considerable element of Gentile colonists as well as the native population. Galilee was in the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas, who was not on friendly terms with the Jews (cf. n. 21). Antioch and Phoenicia were in the province of Syria, where Vitellius was not likely to tolerate unauthorized arrests by agents of the Sanhedrin. For the hostility between the Jews and the

Gentiles at Caesarea cf. *Antt.* xx. viii. 7, *B.J.* II. xiv. 4, 5, xviii. 1, *Vita* 11, etc. However much Pilate's authority might have broken down at Jerusalem there would inevitably be some elements of the Roman garrison left at the official capital, and this, with the support of the local population, would be adequate to prevent the Sanhedrin from sending its agents to the city. The relations between the Jews and the Gentiles in the mixed cities of the ancient territory of the Philistines were most unfriendly, cf. below, c. III. § ii. n. 3.

44. The Sanhedrin in the eyes of the Roman government was the municipal senate of Jerusalem, with jurisdiction over the city and the country surrounding it. The theory that it possessed some wider powers over the Jewish nation outside its own territory is apparently accepted by Schürer (*G.J.V.* III. 114), who, however, doubts whether the privileges claimed, and in some cases exercised, by the Jewish authorities over members of the nation outside Judaea had any legal validity. In point of fact the only instance of their exercise which he quotes is that of S. Paul's mission to Damascus in Acts ix. 2. Naturally in theory the High Priest and the Sanhedrin had authority over all Jews throughout the world, an authority which was exercised through the local synagogues. These bodies would also recognize it, and in so far as they had in certain cases a limited local competence over their members (see c. VI. § iv. n. 20 and § v. n. 27) that claim had some show of reality. But there is conclusive evidence that the Sanhedrin did not in fact possess any direct jurisdiction outside the limits of the territory of Jerusalem (*i.e.* Judaea proper, except for the territories belonging to independent cities such as Caesarea or Joppa), and consequently that it could only exercise authority over members of the nation outside that territory in virtue of the fact that the synagogues were in certain cases recognized as possessing a limited local jurisdiction, and might choose to exercise it in accordance with the wishes expressed by the High Priest by letter or by agent. Thus in Mk iii. 6 the breach between the Pharisees and Our Lord results not in the sending of letters from the Sanhedrin for His apprehension, but in an intrigue between the Pharisees and Herodians, the object of which is to persuade Herod Antipas to take action against Him. Had the Sanhedrin possessed powers outside Judaea it would have been easy to write to the synagogues of Galilee to order His arrest; but in point of fact the danger is from direct action by Antipas (Lk. xiii. 31). The danger from the Sanhedrin only begins with the journey to Jerusalem (Mk x. 32 *seqq.*, cf. Jno. vii. 1). Similarly we have no record of any attempt to interfere with the preaching of Christianity at Antioch or elsewhere in the Dispersion, an omission only explicable on the supposition that the Sanhedrin knew that it was useless to try to exercise a jurisdiction which the Empire did not recognize. (It is indeed possible and probable that some of the beatings referred to in 2 Cor. xi. 24 were inflicted on S. Paul by local synagogues as a result of letters from the Sanhedrin, but there is no evidence to this effect.) The conclusive proof however is furnished by *B.J.* I. xxiv. 2, where Josephus states as evidence of the remarkable powers granted by Augustus to Herod the Great that he was able *τὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ φεύγοντα καὶ μὴ προσηκούσης πόλεως ἐξαγαγεῖν*. Clearly this extraordinary right of extradition was not inherited by the Sanhedrin; it would not be mentioned by Josephus in these terms, if it had. For the exact extent of the territory of Jerusalem cf. *G.J.V.* II. 229 *seqq.*

45. It may be noted that even within the limits of its own jurisdiction the powers of the Sanhedrin were hampered by its lack of any efficient force for preventing or detecting crime, a failing common to most of the city-states of antiquity. In Acts iv. 1 and v. 26 it appears from the mention of the *στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ* that the Temple police forces were used for arresting criminals, but it is clear from both cases that this body was not very efficient for the purpose, since they had to avoid violence for fear of the people. The proper function of this body of Levites was of course that of guarding the Temple. A similar fear of a riot prevents the open arrest of Our Lord, which has to be effected by night, with the assistance of Judas, in order to enable the force employed to find Him alone (Mk xiv. 2, 11, 43). The description given suggests an entirely irregular and unorganized force, and it is suggestive that the arrest is apparently entrusted to a personal slave of the High Priest (*v.* 47). The Lucan account of the arrest mentions vaguely *στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, but the phrase is so loose and inaccurate that it is impossible to be certain that it is not intended to refer vaguely to leading Jews. The Fourth Gospel represents

a force of soldiers lent by Pilate as taking part in the arrest, and the incident of Mt. xxvii. 62 suggests that it was not uncommon for the Jewish authorities to use the Roman force in this way. According to the Fourth Gospel a previous attempt without this assistance had proved unsuccessful (vii. 32, 46). Whether this Gospel is historical or not, it is often well-informed on these matters, and it seems likely that troops from the garrison would be so employed. In any case it is clear that the police arrangements of Jerusalem were very inadequate even within the city, and still less adequate in the outlying parts of Judaea. Cf. Jno. xi. 54, where Our Lord avoids arrest by returning to Ephraim, a village near the wilderness of Beth-aven, lying to the north of Jerusalem and about fifteen miles off. (It seems to have been close to Bethel, cf. *B.J.* IV. ix. 9.) Here He is more or less safe, as He also is in the Jewish territory on the far side of Jordan in x. 40, xi. 8, 16.

This seems to be the explanation of the fact that in Acts viii. 1 the refugees find means of preaching in some of the rural districts of Judaea. There would be no efficient means of pursuing or tracing them. It may be noted that the places mentioned in ix. 32 suggest that these earliest Churches in Judaea are some distance from Jerusalem (see below, c. III. § 2, n. 8). The whole view given above is supported by the failure of all attempts to suppress the *sicarii* in the later stages of the history of Jerusalem (*Antt.* XX. viii. 5, 10).

Thus it seems likely that the refugees could either return after a short time, or remain in the districts to which they had fled without interference. On the other hand it seems that the original evangelists of Antioch are Cypriot and Cyrenean Jews who reach that city with the intention of taking ship to their native countries (Acts xi. 19), as some of the Cypriots actually did (cf. c. IV. § i. n. 68).

46. For the Jewish colony at Damascus cf. *B.J.* II. xx. 2. It would seem from Acts ix. 13, 14 that S. Paul's authority included the right to bring Jewish Christians permanently resident in Damascus to Jerusalem. Probably, however, the main object of the journey was to secure any who might have fled thither. In either case his proceedings would be equally illegal from the point of view of a Roman legate of Syria.

47. The account given in the text seems to be the only possible explanation of the otherwise incomprehensible journey of S. Paul to Damascus. If the city was still in Roman hands his proceedings were entirely illegal. The most he could hope to do would be to persuade the synagogues of Damascus to act on the letters from the High Priest by inflicting on the local Christians such punishments as they were allowed to inflict on their members. [It is unlikely that these amounted to more than beating with "forty stripes save one," since S. Paul makes no mention of any severer punishment inflicted on himself by the Jews. The stoning at Lystra was of course entirely illegal.] Probably he would have exposed himself to severe penalties by attempting to do anything more. On the other hand Acts ix. 2 and xxii. 5 agree in representing it as his object to deport the Damascene Christians to Jerusalem.

If, however, the city was already in the hands of Aretas the whole incident is capable of easy explanation. S. Paul pursues the Christians to Damascus, not to Caesarea or Antioch, whither the majority had fled, because he knew that his letters from the Sanhedrin would be as worthless in the latter cities as they would be in Samaria or the tetrarchy of Antipas. On the other hand Aretas himself only held Damascus in virtue of the fact that he had occupied it by force at a time when the Roman armies of the East were fully engaged in other matters. He seems from his self-chosen title of "Lover of his people," as against Φιλόκαισαρ or Φιλορώμαιος, to have followed a nationalist and anti-Roman policy, so far as the circumstances of the time allowed; and at the moment they seemed to favour his ambition. Naturally he would be anxious to allow every facility to S. Paul as the emissary of the Sanhedrin, in the hope of thereby conciliating the Jews. It would be of service to him in his quarrel with Herod Antipas to be on friendly terms with the recognized religious authorities of the Jewish nation, as a means of detaching the pious Jews of Galilee from their allegiance to the Tetrarch. Hence it is not surprising that he should have allowed S. Paul a free hand, and that he should some two years later have allowed his lieutenant in the city to assist the Jews of Damascus in their attempts on S. Paul's life (2 Cor. xi. 32). Cf. nn. 18–20.

Naturally if Damascus passed to Aretas by a friendly cession on the part of the Empire, as most authorities hold, and not by a forced occupation of the city, it

would still be possible for him to allow S. Paul, as the agent of the Sanhedrin, such powers over his Jewish subjects in Damascus as he saw fit, except in the case of those who were Roman citizens. He would still find it advantageous to conciliate the Jews as a means of undermining the position of Antipas. The arguments usually advanced against the theory that he seized the city by force seem however to be inconclusive for the reasons stated in n. 20.

The view that the attitude of Aretas was so well known that his consent could be taken for granted is of course only a conjecture, but we hear nothing of any negotiations with him, and the time available seems somewhat short to allow for them. Possibly S. Paul carried letters either to Aretas or his local representative, as well as to the synagogues.

48. This seems to be the explanation of the account given by S. Paul of his vision in Acts xxvi. 14, where the phrase *πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν* is a reminiscence of *Pss. Sol.* xvi. 4. In this case the goad is the voice of God speaking through the conscience. From the account of his experience given by S. Paul in this passage it would seem that from the psychological point of view the vision is to be regarded as the solution in an externalized form of the doubts already existing in his own mind. This of course does not affect in any way the question of its genuineness as a manifestation of the risen Christ. It appears however that it occurred at a moment when his doubts had reached the crisis, while the details as to the form of the vision, its language and the words used are of course supplied from S. Paul's own habitual methods of thought and his knowledge of Christian teaching.

49. The view that S. Paul's journey to Arabia referred to in Gal. i. 17 was a missionary journey hardly needs discussing. From the first S. Paul's conception of his call involves the belief that he is to be the Apostle of the Gentiles (Acts ix. 15, xxii. 14, xxvi. 17, Gal. i. 16). This Apostolate however must necessarily be exercised through the medium of Judaism (see below, c. IV. § i. nn. 19, 28). That he should have begun his career by a mission to the Arabians of Nabatea, rather than by a mission in Damascus or at Jerusalem, is most improbable; if he was to appeal direct to the Jews of the Dispersion and through them to the Gentiles, he would, as a Hellenist, naturally turn to the Greek-speaking Jews of the West, not to Jewish settlers in Arabia. [Damascus was of course at this period thoroughly hellenized in superficial matters, such as language (*G.J.V.* II. 150), whereas the Nabatean kingdom, as its inscriptions show, was not.] See further, c. IV. § i. n. 1.

50. S. Paul represents himself as taking a leading part in the persecution in Gal. i. 13 (cf. Acts xxvi. 10).

So in Acts ix. 1 he is represented as suggesting to the High Priest the journey to Damascus, and Ananias has heard of him as the leader of the persecutors (*ib.* 13). Hence it appears that in fact he was mainly if not entirely responsible for its continuance after the martyrdom of S. Stephen. Thus it may be conjectured that his withdrawal would in any case have led to its abandonment.

51. See n. 17.

52. See Appendix to this Chapter.

53. Cf. c. I. n. 16, and especially the reference to Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium*, given there.

54. *Antt.* XVIII. iv. 3. This was the state robe worn by the High Priest on the three great festivals and the day of Atonement. The fact that it was in the custody of the procurator enabled him to use it as a pledge of the good conduct of the Jews, but was naturally a standing grievance. Cf. *Antt.* XX. i. 1, where the attempt of Fadus to resume its custody after the death of Herod Agrippa I was abandoned by Claudius, who had originally ordered it, at the request of an embassy from the Sanhedrin, supported by the younger Agrippa. It is noticeable that before demanding its restoration to Roman keeping Fadus had thought it advisable to secure the support of the Syrian legions under Cassius Longinus.

55. See Appendix.

56. Cf. n. 17.

57. Marcellus, the officer of Vitellius' staff appointed by him to act as procurator on the deposition of Pilate, would seem to have held the post from some time preceding the Passover of 36 until some time after the Pentecost of 37, when the news of the death of Tiberius reached Palestine, since Maryllus the next procurator was not appointed by Tiberius but by Caligula (*Antt.* XVIII. vi. 10 *ad fin.*).

APPENDIX

THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD UNDER THE ROMAN GOVERNMENT

At first sight the policy of the Roman procurators of Judaea (or the legates of Syria on the occasions of their direct intervention in Jewish affairs) and the later rulers of the Herodian dynasty with regard to the tenure of the High Priesthood seems entirely incomprehensible. We have a bewildering mixture of long tenures and rapid changes, without, in most cases, any evidence that the length or shortness of the period of office was due to the character of the holder. Between the beginning of the government of Gratus in A.D. 15 and the outbreak of the rebellion in A.D. 67 we have seventeen High Priests. Of these fifty-two years thirty are occupied by the pontificates of Caiaphas and Ananias, son of Nebedaeus, lasting respectively for eighteen and twelve years. In the remaining twenty-two years we have fifteen High Priests.

If we examine the details of the history, we find that the course of events is as follows. Gratus on coming into office deposes Annas, who had been High Priest for nine years, and appoints Ishmael, son of Phiabi, who is replaced after no long time (μετ' οὐ πολύ) by Eleazar, son of Annas. Eleazar after a year is replaced by Simon, son of Camithus, who again after no more than a year gives way to Caiaphas, the son-in-law of Annas (*Antt.* XVIII. ii. 2). Caiaphas holds office for the remainder of the procuratorship of Gratus and throughout the whole ten years of Pilate's office, *i.e.* from about A.D. 18 to the beginning of 36 (n. 17). At the Passover of 36 Vitellius deposes Caiaphas in favour of Jonathan, son of Annas (*Antt.* XVIII. iv. 3), and at the Pentecost of 37 he replaces Jonathan by his brother Theophilus (*Antt.* XVIII. v. 3). Theophilus remains High Priest throughout the reign of Caligula, during the latter part of which Judaea is apparently under the direct control of Petronius, the legate of Syria (n. 16 and c. v. § ii. n. 2). In A.D. 41 Herod Agrippa I arrives in his kingdom. His policy of placating the religious feelings of his subjects does not prevent him from appointing three High Priests in as many years, namely, Simon Cantheras, son of Boethos, Matthias, son of Annas, and Elionaios, son of Cantheras (*Antt.* XIX. vi. 2 and 4, and viii. 1). On his death the right of appointment is given to Herod of Chalcis after the preliminary dispute as to the custody of the robe of office, referred to in n. 54. He replaces Elionaios by Joseph, son of Cami, and Joseph by Ananias, son of Nebedaeus, dying himself shortly afterwards apparently in A.D. 48 (*Antt.* XX. i. 3 and v. 2, where the death of Herod is put in the eighth year of Claudius). It is not clear who exercised the right of appointment on the death of Herod of Chalcis. If it went to the procurator it was not exercised either by Cumanus or Felix, while if it went to Herod Agrippa II, son of Herod Agrippa I, he was a mere child at the time of his father's death

and presumably was unable to make use of his powers at first (*Antt.* XIX. ix. 2 and *B.J.* II. xi. 6). Nor would it be easy for him to exercise it independently while Felix was procurator, in view of the influence of the brother of Pallas. In any case Ananias continued High Priest until about A.D. 59, when Agrippa II, who had by this time, if not earlier, been allowed the right of nomination, replaced him by Ishmael, son of Phiabi (to be distinguished from the High Priest of the same name appointed by Gratus). He seems to have remained in office until A.D. 61, after which there was a series of changes, five High Priests being appointed between that year and the outbreak of the war in A.D. 67. One of these, Annas or Ananos, son of Annas the father-in-law of Caiaphas, only held office for three months, being deposed by Albinus for the murder of S. James the Lord's brother (see below, c. III. § ii. n. 36).

It must be remembered that in theory the High Priest held office for life, and that in consequence such changes cannot have been popular among the Pharisees and the devout Jews. The first instance of such a change dated from the deposition of Onias by Antiochus Epiphanes, which obviously could not be regarded as a precedent. Aristobulus had indeed deposed his brother Hyrcanus in 67 B.C., but their subsequent quarrels had largely depended on the refusal of many of the Jews to admit the validity of the enforced resignation of Hyrcanus. Consequently it was regarded as a breach of the Law when in 37 B.C. Herod the Great deposed Ananel the Babylonian Jew whom he had appointed two years previously, in order to make room for Aristobulus, and avoid a dynastic quarrel (*Antt.* XV. iii. 1). Even so on the murder of Aristobulus the office reverted as a matter of course to Ananel (*ib.* 3), and it was only the later proceedings of Herod that made such changes too familiar to excite opposition. Nevertheless they remained unpopular as is clear from *Antt.* XIX. vi. 2, 3, where Josephus, who is anxious to represent Herod Agrippa I in the most favourable light, implies that the remission of the house-tax in Jerusalem was a mark of his appreciation of the willingness of the people to accept his re-arrangements of the holders of the High Priesthood.

This detail throws a certain light on the reasons underlying the changes. It will be observed that the longest periods are those of Caiaphas and Ananias, son of Nebedaeus. The former of these begins in the fourth year of Gratus and ends with the deposition of Pilate; Ananias was appointed by Herod of Chalcis about the year of his death, and his tenure coincides with the government of Cumanus and Felix. Of the four procurators concerned Gratus alone is not definitely notorious for his misgovernment. It will however be observed that in his opening years of office he was responsible for a series of changes; it is only from his fourth year onwards, when he might expect to be recalled at any moment, that the permanence

of Caiaphas dates. Pilate's misgovernment was such that he could not face the risk of an embassy to the Emperor from the Jews. The same holds good of Cumanus and Felix; the latter had indeed a strong supporter at court in the person of his brother Pallas, but this very fact would provide any embassy sent from the Jews to complain of his misgovernment with strong support from the rivals of Pallas at the Imperial court. Now any official embassy of complaint against the governor would have to come from the Sanhedrin, and would hardly be sent without the consent of the High Priest. Consequently it looks as though in the cases of Caiaphas and Ananias, son of Nebedaeus, the long tenure of office was part of a more or less clear understanding between the procurator and the High Priest, by which the latter was to continue in office, and to secure the former against formal embassies from the Jews to Rome to complain of his conduct.

The only other High Priest whose period of office was of any considerable duration was Theophilus, son of Annas (A.D. 37–41). But of this period about a year and a half falls into the time when Petronius, the legate of Syria, was negotiating as to the design of Caligula to set up his statue in the Temple. It was only natural that in view of his sympathy for the Jews he should avoid complicating the situation by changing the High Priest; and after allowing for this fact the period left for the tenure of Theophilus only runs from the Pentecost of 37 until the arrival of Petronius in the last months of 39. If this pontificate be treated as exceptional, we get fourteen High Priests in eighteen years. It is even possible that we ought to allow for another appointment by Herod of Chalcis, since in *Antt.* III. xv. 3 Josephus alludes to a certain Ishmael, who was High Priest at the time of the great famine under Claudius, but is not mentioned in his narrative of the period. Schürer (*G.J.V.* II. 272) treats the earlier allusion as a blunder of Josephus, but if so, it is necessary to include among the High Priests from the accession of Herod the Great to the fall of the city a certain Joseph, son of Ellem, who only held office for a day on account of the levitical uncleanness of the existing High Priest Matthias on the day of Atonement, in order to arrive at the number of twenty-eight High Priests given in *Antt.* XX. x. 5 between 37 B.C. and 68 A.D. It is at least possible that Ishmael has been omitted in the main narrative, and that in fact he held office for a year during the period when the right of nomination rested with Herod of Chalcis.

In any case, however, the facts show a very close approximation to an annual High Priesthood during the periods not already accounted for. In the first four years of Gratus, the two years when Vitellius was in charge of Judaea, the reign of Herod Agrippa I, and during the time when Herod Agrippa II held the right of appointment, the coincidence is almost

exact. This is suggestive. From the official Roman point of view, with which the two Agrippas would be familiar, it would be natural to hold that the office ought to be annual, and in view of the continual political unrest in Judaea it would obviously seem desirable to make it so in fact and thus avoid the danger of allowing the holder of the office to acquire an influence over the public which would enable him to become a political danger. Consequently it seems not unreasonable to suppose that there was a general view in Roman official circles interested in the government of Judaea that the High Priest should be changed annually, with occasional extensions of office for a second year, and that it was carried out with sufficient regularity to make it appear at certain periods, even to the Jewish mind, that the High Priesthood had in fact become an annual office. This is supported by the curious statement in Jno. xviii. 13 that Caiaphas was High Priest τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου. The writer of the Fourth Gospel in several places shows signs of being well-informed as to the political conditions of Judaea at the time of the Crucifixion and shortly afterwards; and the statement, apparently implying that the High Priesthood was an annual office, might well be made by one who was familiar with affairs in Jerusalem between A.D. 36 and 46, when, including Caiaphas himself, there were eight High Priests in eleven years, the only long pontificate being the exceptional one of Theophilus. (The view that the language of Jno. xviii. 13 does not imply an annual High Priesthood is simply due to a desire to defend the verbal inspiration of the Gospel.)

In spite of the advantages of frequent changes the system had the drawback that no individual High Priest had sufficient influence to restrain the extremer nationalists; and it was from the circle of the Sadducean houses that the best friends of the Romans were drawn. Consequently they were unable to check the rebellion, or to assert themselves as the leaders of the moderate patriots against the zealots. The most influential of the men who had held office at the time of the rebellion was probably Ananias, son of Nebedaeus (*Antt.* xx. ix. 2–4), who was however murdered soon after the beginning of the rebellion as a friend of the Romans and Agrippa (*B.J.* II. xvii. 6, 9). To some extent this drawback would seem to have been counteracted by the fact that the office was confined to a small group of families, the most notable being the house of Annas. He was himself High Priest for nine years, and his five sons held office at different periods (*Antt.* xx. ix. 1), while Caiaphas was his son-in-law (Jno. xviii. 13). If the Johannine narrative be correct he was in fact the power behind the throne during Caiaphas' tenure of office. They were thorough-going Sadducees and for this reason the Pharisees hated them, and have left in rabbinical literature a lurid picture of their conduct (*Life and Times*, I. 263, 372).

The accounts are corroborated by the conduct of the younger Annas in *Antt.* xx. ix. 1, but the story of his brother Jonathan in *Antt.* xix. vi. 4, and the attempts of this member of the house to influence Felix to improve his methods of government, efforts which cost him his life, seem to indicate that he at least was reasonably conscientious in his political activities and a patriot according to his lights. In general the attitude of the family was that ascribed to Caiaphas in Jno. xi. 47 *seqq.*, and it is probably for this reason that the Roman authorities and the Herods allowed them so large a share of office. Of the remaining High Priests of the period the wealthiest and most influential was Ananias, son of Nebedaeus, the High Priest of Acts xxiii. 2. He was a man of great wealth and importance, though his violence and rapacity were notorious (*Antt.* xx. ix. 2; it should be noted that in the latter reference from *Life and Times* given above he is wrongly identified with the younger Annas or Ananus). It was his submission to blackmailing at the hands of the *sicarii* (*Antt. ib.* 3) and his willingness to intrigue with them as described in Acts xxiii. 12 that compromised the High Priesthood before the outbreak of the rebellion; and it was his son Eleazar who facilitated its outbreak by abandoning the traditional Sadducean policy of friendship with Rome and persuading the priests to refuse to offer the sacrifices for the Emperor, an action which amounted to a formal declaration of war (*B.J.* II. xvii. 2). On the other hand their attempts to keep the rebellion within limits which would permit of an ultimate reconciliation with Rome led to the murder of most of the leading members of the Sadducean party by the extremists.

CHAPTER III

THE FIRST EXTENSION OF THE CHURCH

§ i. PHILIP AT SAMARIA

THE refugees driven from Jerusalem by the persecution of Saul, especially those of Hellenist origin, were by no means disposed to regard the disaster as in any way interfering with their duty to bear witness to the teachings of Jesus. It was rather an opportunity for preaching the news of the new revelation to those who as yet had not heard it. Jerusalem had once again rejected the truth; but Jerusalem was not the world. As long as the Master's return was delayed, it was their duty to summon to repentance and forgiveness all who were willing to hear.

The immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem was of course no safe place for them in their flight. But in the outlying areas of Judaea, especially in those adjoining the fringe of Hellenic cities on the coast of Palestine, the authority of the Sanhedrin was weak; and in Galilee it was non-existent[1]. Still, so long as the message was confined to the members of the Chosen People and to proselytes, their action in preaching outside Jerusalem, though it would have imposed on the Twelve the duty of organizing the Church in such a way as to permit of the existence of Christian communities outside the city, would not have raised any question as to the fundamental principles of the Christian movement. The Hellenists, however, had differed widely from the older leaders of the Church in their attitude towards the Jewish faith, and the circumstances of their flight left little opportunity for reflection on the probable effects of their actions on the Christians of Jerusalem—a city which after all it was possible that they would never see again.

Consequently when in his flight Philip, who stood next to Stephen among the Hellenist leaders[2], made his way to Sebaste, the capital of the Samaritan country[3], he proceeded without hesitation to preach his Gospel to the local population. That population, apart from the large number of Gentile colonists introduced by Herod the Great into the city itself, was mainly Israelite in origin (though with a considerable admixture of Gentile blood)[4], and Jewish in religion. Since however it had from the days of Ezra been cut off by Jewish hostility from the later developments of the main stream of Judaism, it accepted only the Mosaic Law, as laid down in the Pentateuch, and rejected the later accretions of scribal tradition. Further the same hostility had forced the Samaritans to replace the Temple at Jerusalem by one of their own on Mount Gerizim[5]. The relation

between the two sections of the nation was embittered by frequent quarrels. The Samaritans could always interfere with the passage of pilgrims from Galilee to the festivals at Jerusalem, and Jewish patriots could always find means of retaliating[6]. On the other hand it could not be denied that in some sense the Samaritans were Israelites by extraction, and that in some sense they observed the Law, and might therefore be within the covenant between God and His Chosen People[7]. Philip indeed under the influence of the teaching of Stephen was little inclined to regard such considerations, and began to preach the Gospel without reflecting on the complications which his action might produce at Jerusalem. His efforts were accompanied by various cures of sickness and similar manifestations of divine power, which secured for his teaching an enthusiastic welcome. Among those converted was a certain Simon, who on the strength of some real or alleged miracles in the form of the healing of diseases and exorcism had successfully made good his claim to be regarded locally as the coming Messiah[8]. To his more educated followers he had revealed certain esoteric doctrines to justify his position[8]. In any case he recognized in Philip's miracles a power superior to his own, and was prepared to accept on their evidence the belief that Jesus was the Messiah, and the doctrine that it was only through baptism that he could obtain a share in the Messianic kingdom which was shortly to be expected[9].

With the abatement of the persecution the news of Philip's success reached Jerusalem. Deprived of all the liberal elements among its Hellenist members the Church in that city was not likely to view the conversion of Samaria with any great enthusiasm. Even if Stephen in his teaching before his trial by the Sanhedrin had explicitly drawn the inference, which it certainly implied, that the old distinction between the Jew and the rest of mankind had merely been one instance of the failure of the nation to understand aright the message which they had been chosen to proclaim to the world, his teaching had produced but little effect on the Hebrew Christians; even if they had heard it, they certainly had not accepted it[10]. Even if some of the Hebrews had been inclined to sympathise with Stephen, the success of the persecution was not calculated to encourage the majority to adopt his doctrines in practice in the present instance. As Galileans many leading members of the Church had every reason for feeling in the strongest measure the national hatred of Samaria[11]. Again, apart from this, Hebrews could hardly view with favour the admission of Samaritans to the Church at a moment when Jerusalem was still

unconverted and Judaea almost untouched. Such admissions were not only a preference of the Samaritans to the true Israel, but also likely to alienate the latter.

The result was a vigorous controversy[12]. The Lord Himself had not chosen to make Samaria the scene of any large part of His ministry, and had uttered on one occasion words which might be taken as a deliberate command not to evangelize Samaria, at any rate until the Gospel had been preached to the whole of Israel, while He had on another occasion experienced that discourtesy which the Samaritans were in the habit of offering to pilgrims to Jerusalem from Galilee. On the other hand He had on this occasion rebuked the desire of His more ardent followers for the summary infliction of a divine vengeance, and He had on other occasions contrasted the Samaritans favourably with the Jews as a rebuke to His own nation. Such were the arguments adduced in the controversy excited by the action of Philip. None the less, since the Samaritans had already been baptized, it was hardly practicable to exclude them from the Christian society. It was necessary to remember that they were in some sense Israelites, or at any rate might be[13]. The result of the debate among the Hebrew Christians was that the two chiefs of the Apostolic college, Peter and John, were sent down to Samaria to visit the Samaritan converts and to decide as to the possibility of their admission to the full membership of the community. Hitherto they had not received the Holy Ghost, and until this gift had been vouchsafed to them they could not be regarded as standing on the same level as the rest of the Christian body[14]. Incidentally there were other questions to be solved, such as the relation of Samaritan Christians to their local Temple on Mount Gerizim. It would be difficult for the Hebrews to countenance them, if they insisted on continuing to worship there, or for Samaritans to abandon it in favour of the Temple at Jerusalem[15].

Accordingly Peter and John went down to Samaria. Unwilling to act on their own authority alone, although the spiritual state of the Samaritans showed no reason for hesitation, they prayed for a manifestation of the divine approval to justify them in ratifying the work of Philip. This was granted, the imposition of hands being followed by the descent of the Holy Ghost in the form of an outward manifestation of such a kind as to place the matter beyond all possibility of doubt. So much was Simon impressed by the powers revealed by the leaders of the new movement that he was prepared to offer money in payment for the secret of the means of exercising them.

Regarding the Church as a new Messianic movement, which was only waiting its time for a fuller revelation of its purpose, he hoped by his action to obtain a claim to take a prominent part in it when its purpose was achieved and the earthly kingdom established[16]. He could thus incidentally retain his position as a leading personality in the religious world of Samaria; and it is possible that he knew by vague report that certain prominent benefactors of the Church stood high in the counsels of the Christian body of Jerusalem[17]. His offer was naturally rejected with scorn, and Simon was given to understand clearly that the object of the Christian movement was utterly different from those which had characterized his own Messianic programme with its attempted combination of religious leadership and personal advancement. In this respect the new movement was to be utterly distinct from its competitors.

The Apostles returned to Jerusalem, Philip accompanying them. So clear was the divine approval of the new departure, that the opportunity was taken of preaching in the Samaritan villages through which they passed. There could be no further question of the right of the Samaritans to share in the privileges of the rest of Israel in hearing the Gospel. The recognition of the right was however bound to react on the whole system of Christianity. It was unthinkable that the Samaritans should continue to share in the worship of the Temple of Mount Gerizim, since by doing so they condemned their Jewish fellow-Christians for continuing to worship in Jerusalem. On the other hand it was hardly possible to expect that they should abandon their national associations to such an extent as to recognize Jerusalem as the sole place chosen for the worship of the God of Israel, and so cut themselves off entirely from their countrymen. The natural and inevitable solution was that Samaritan converts should cease to observe the ancient worship of Israel in any form, and be content with the religious system which Christianity provided and the worship of the Samaritan synagogues[18] in so far as their adhesion to the new Jewish Messianic movement did not involve their exclusion from the religion of the rest of the Samaritan people.

The arrangement, although in itself a temporary compromise, involved a momentous principle. It was made easier by the fact that the first missionary had been a colleague and supporter of Stephen, who had himself been inclined to set little store by the forms of Jewish worship[19]; but logically it committed the Church to the ratification of Stephen's doctrine that the revelation of the Founder of Christianity had in fact abolished the necessity of adhering to the

old system[20]. The Jewish Christian might still maintain its necessity, and regard the Samaritan who neglected it as being therefore his inferior; and in virtue of the fact that the Hebrews continued to uphold the old claim to the possession of a natural superiority they remained for more than a decade on bad terms with their Samaritan neighbours. None the less the work of Philip and its recognition by the Twelve had committed the Church to the recognition of the fact that the whole system of the worship of the Temple, hitherto accepted without question by the followers of Jesus, was not a necessary part of the divine revelation. If the Samaritan could be a member of the new society without observing the worship of the Temple, it must be possible for others to be admitted on the same terms. This could only mean that the central point of Judaism was recognized as being no longer an essential part of the true religion. This was the belief which had cost Stephen his life; the Hebrew Christians might endeavour to ignore it for the moment, but the action of Philip had in fact committed the whole Church to its acceptance.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III, SECTION I

1. See c. II. n. 43, and for the mixed Jewish and Gentile cities on the outskirts of Judaea § ii. n. 3.

2. This would appear to be implied by the fact that he stands second on the list in Acts vi. 5, though it is possible that he is only mentioned in that position in view of the prominence he is to assume in c. viii. This prominence again may only be due to the fact that S. Luke was better informed as to his later career than he was with regard to those of the rest of the Seven.

3. Assuming the correctness of the reading *τὴν πόλιν* in Acts viii. 5. The reading however is doubtful. In any case it would be natural for Philip to make his way to Sebaste, the ancient Samaria, and the largest Samaritan city, rather than to some smaller town, since he would find there a better opening for the preaching of the Gospel.

4. For the history and character of the population of Samaria in general cf. *C.J.V.* II. 18 *seqq.* The earliest account of the origin of the Samaritan community in 2 Kings xvii. 24 *seqq.* is like the rest of Jewish literature on this subject, thoroughly tendencious, and the fact that the Israelite religion survived and finally won the day as against the religions of the colonists may be taken as proof that there was a sufficient Israelite element left in the land to assimilate in the end the new inhabitants. The quarrel between the Samaritans and the Jews originated with the refusal of the latter to admit the former to a share in the building of the Temple (Ezra iv. 1 *seqq.*, and cf. Neh. iv *seqq.*). It is clear that the bulk of the Jews at this period were quite ready to meet the Samaritans on equal terms, and that it needed the most strenuous efforts on the part of Ezra and Nehemiah to prevent them from doing so (Ez. ix, x, Neh. vi. 10–19, xiii. 4 *seqq.*). The acceptance of the Pentateuch by the Samaritans and the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim date apparently from the expulsion of the son of Joiada, the High Priest, recorded in Neh. xiii. 28. (So Schürer, *loc. cit.* and König in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 69, as against *Antt.* XI. viii. 2, which ascribes the building of the Temple to a similar incident, but places it a century later.) The rivalry of the Temples necessarily perpetuated the breach, since both sides claimed that their Temple alone was the true one (*Antt.* XII. i. 1, XIII. iii. 4, and the rabbinical references in *Hor. Hebr.* on Jno. iv. 20). The Judaism

of the Samaritans was however, since they recognized only the written Law and not its unwritten traditions, less rigid in its character, and probably would have succumbed to the hellenizing policy of Antiochus Epiphanes; they were ready to call their Temple the Temple of Zeus Hellenios and so to avoid trouble, their attitude in the matter being apparently the same as that of the hellenizing Jews described in 1 Macc. i. 11 *seqq.*; they also took advantage of their mixed origin to deny that they were of Jewish nationality (*Antt.* XII. v. 5). This Josephus describes, probably not without justice, as their traditional policy (*Antt.* XI. viii. 6), just as he is in a certain sense correct in describing their Temple as a copy of that in Jerusalem (*Antt.* XIII. ix. 1, *B.J.* I. ii. 6), and the Samaritans themselves as the race of Cutheans, who lived round it (*ib.*, but in *Antt.* XI. viii. 6 they are apostate Jews). That their religion was actually identical with a somewhat lax Judaism is in fact admitted by Josephus in *Antt.* XI. viii. 7, where he records that after the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim any Jew who was accused of eating unclean meats or breaking the Sabbath, or any similar offence, would take refuge with them, alleging that the charge was unjust. Obviously there would be no need for him to deny the charge, unless the Samaritans themselves observed these laws, and it is possible that some of the Jews who thus went over to the Samaritans were fugitives not from the Law so much as from the growing burden of scribal tradition. Incidentally it may be noted that the practice would increase the admixture of Hebrew blood among the Samaritans.

The grievance against the Temple on Mount Gerizim led to a continual strife between the two peoples, the most striking incident in which was the capture of Samaria and the demolition of the Temple on Mount Gerizim by the sons of John Hyrcanus about 107 B.C. It was restored on a magnificent scale by Herod the Great, the settlers in the city, renamed Sebaste, being partly drawn from old mercenaries of Herod's army, partly from the population of the adjoining districts. The hatred of the Jews was returned by the Samaritans, who were always ready to seize any opportunity of interfering with Jewish pilgrims from Galilee (*Antt.* XX. vi. 1, cf. Lk. ix. 51), or of outraging Jewish sentiments, as in the incident recorded in *Antt.* XVIII. ii. 2, when they introduced dead men's bones into the Temple on the eve of the Passover.

From the fact that Samaritans fought for Herod the Great, and for the Romans after the death of Archelaus, while a Samaritan force is found in Caesarea at the time of the death of Herod Agrippa I, Schürer (*G.J.V.* I. 460 *seqq.*) infers that they formed part of the regular garrison of Judaea. This fact cannot have failed to increase the hatred of the Jews, who had no love for the procurator's troops. It is of interest to observe that the Samaritans did not apparently share that conception of the duty of observing the Sabbath in virtue of which the Jews successfully claimed exemption from military service under the Roman Empire. (It is however possible that the Samaritan levies were drawn from the Gentile settlers.)

For further instances of the Jewish hatred for the Samaritans cf. Ecclus. l. 26, *Mart. Is.* iii. 1, *Jub.* xxx, and *Test. Lev.* v *seqq.*; in both of the latter the action of Levi and Simeon in massacring the men of Shechem is represented, in defiance of Gen. xxxiv. 30, as being highly laudable. There can be little doubt as to the reason. Cf. *Antt.* I. xxi, *Bibl. Antt.* viii. 7, and also the treatment of the incident by Philo, *De Migr. Abr.* 39 (M. I. 472).

5. Cf. Schürer and König as referred to in the preceding notes for the religion of the Samaritans and the Samaritan Pentateuch. In general Jno. iv gives an accurate picture of the Samaritan religion. It accepts Judaism, but in an ignorant and unintelligent manner, and wrongly claims to possess the true Temple, but is otherwise very much the same as a rather lax Judaism of the kind common among uneducated Jews. See further, n. 7.

6. See references in n. 4.

7. The Jewish Rabbis seem to have found the position of the Samaritans somewhat difficult to determine. There could be no doubt that the Samaritans were detested as much as, if not more than, the Gentiles who possessed parts of the land of promise. Thus according to one tradition Ezra himself solemnly excommunicated them by a curse which forbad any Israelite to eat of anything that was a Samaritan's, or any Samaritan to become a proselyte, and excluded the Samaritans from any

portion in the resurrection of the dead. On the other hand they were not in fact idolaters, they were circumcised, they obeyed the Law probably as well as many Israelites, and were or might be Israelites by origin. Hence we find a widely different view, to the effect that the Samaritans may be regarded as true proselytes, or according to a saying attributed to R. Simeon ben Gamaliel "as the Israelites in all things." So "the country, water, dwellings and roads of the Cuthites are clean"; their bread, whether leavened or unleavened, was lawful, and an Israelite might say Amen to their blessings. (For the foregoing doctrines cf. *Hor. Hebr.* on Jno. iv. 4, 8, 9.) If three Israelites have eaten together, they are bound to offer formal prayers together, and the same holds good if one of them be a Samaritan (*Tr. Ber. M.* vii. 1; see also *G.J.V.* II. 22, where further details of a similar kind are given). In general they are to be regarded as in a similar position to the Sadducees, except in so far as the latter are certainly, the Samaritans only possibly, Israelites. Both obey the Law in an inadequate and partial fashion, but cannot therefore be regarded as heathen. In this point however it is probable that the views of the Rabbis were more lenient than those of the ordinary Jew, who was dominated by racial antipathy more than by the niceties of the interpretation of the Law. Hence it is probable that the description of Jno. iv. 9 is nearer to the facts as to the ordinary relations of Jews and Samaritans in Palestine at the period. It would seem however that it is somewhat too sweeping in view of Lk. ix. 51 (cf. ἀλλογενής in Lk. xvii. 18, which, while technically inaccurate, probably is true to popular usage).

8. The view that the whole story of the conversion of Simon in Acts viii was originally intended for S. Paul, and that the incident as recorded there is really due to the incorporation of a story intended to discredit the Apostle of the Gentiles, whose real meaning had been forgotten when the Acts were compiled, need not be considered here. A full discussion of it may be found in Headlam's article on "Simon Magus" in Hastings' *D.B.* IV. 520.

That Simon was locally regarded as the Messiah, or as likely to reveal himself in that character, seems to be implied in the account of him given in Acts viii. 9 *seqq.* The title of ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη seems to be one of the vague and suggestive titles, which it was customary to apply to those who were considered to have some title to be regarded as the Messiah, but had not as yet fully revealed themselves. Thus in Acts v. 36 Theudas is described by Gamaliel as λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν (cf. of Simon, λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν), a phrase which covers a claim to be the Messiah, as is clear from *Antt.* XX. v. 1. (The fact that S. Luke is guilty of an apparent anachronism in making Gamaliel refer to Theudas at all, does not of course reflect on the accuracy of the use of this phrase by Gamaliel of a claimant to the title of the Messiah.) A similar vagueness of language marks the descriptions of Our Lord used by the witnesses of His ministry, as the following passages show:

Mk vi. 14. Our Lord must be John the Baptist, risen from the dead, or Elias or a prophet like one of the old prophets. Cf. the reluctance of the disciples to say more in viii. 28.

Mt. xi. 3 (= Lk. vii. 19). The Baptist asks σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν;

Mt. xii. 23. μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυείδ;

Lk. xxi. 8. The false Christs who are to appear are represented as saying ἐγώ εἰμι, and ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν.

Cf. also the answer of the Baptist to his questioners as given in Jno. i. 20 *seqq.*, and Bar-cochba's title "Son of the Star."

Similarly the effect of the miracles of Simon is described in language closely parallel to that used of the effect of Our Lord's miracles. Cf. Mk i. 27, ii. 12 (where we have the identical word ἐξίστασθαι), and vii. 36. It would seem to have been expected as a matter of course that mighty works would be one of the marks of the Messiah, and no doubt cures or exorcisms, whether genuine or not, formed the main part of the μαγεῖαι of Simon. His title of the δύναμις of God apparently arises from the fact that in these works he shows himself to be a manifestation of the divine omnipotence, just as Our Lord is in the Fourth Gospel the λόγος or manifestation of the divine wisdom. Clearly an impostor might easily invent for himself or be given by his followers a title of this kind on the strength of such

ideas as those of Mk v. 30, Lk. i. 66, iv. 14, 36, v. 17. For the demand for miracles from those regarded as having some claim to be the Messiah cf. Mt. xii. 38 *seqq.*, and the argument of Our Lord as to the power by which He casts out devils, which has immediately preceded it. Cf. also Jno. ii. 18, vii. 31, x. 41, and *B.J.* II. xiii. 4 *seqq.*, *Antt.* xx. viii. 6, for the actual or promised production of miracles by false Messiahs. S. Luke's description of Simon as a sorcerer is of course exactly analogous to Josephus' treatment of the later false Messiahs who are πλάνοι, γόητες and ἀπατεῶνες (see the references given above, and cf. the phrase ἐκεῖνος ὁ πλάνος of Our Lord in Mt. xxvii. 63, and the rabbinical accounts of Our Lord). It would seem then that Simon by his real or supposed powers of healing had led the Samaritans to suppose that he was or might be the Messiah.

It is difficult to suppose that Justin Martyr, in his account of Simon in *Apol.* i. 26, 56 *seqq.*, *Dial.* 120, is not speaking from local knowledge, when he describes the activities of Simon in Samaria; and from the fact that a cult of him survived in the time of Justin, it would seem that he had made a very marked impression in his own country. It is to be presumed that he added to his miracles some doctrinal system; but it would be unsafe to accept as Simon's all the teachings alleged to have been invented by him. As known to us they probably incorporate a good deal of matter added by his followers, to say nothing of their possible distortion by the Christian writers from whom our knowledge of them is derived. They are summarized and investigated by Headlam in the article to which reference has been made above.

Incidentally it may be noted that the appearance of Simon in the Acts falls very shortly after the incident of the Samaritan impostor referred to in c. II. It would seem that Simon must have had considerable abilities of a certain kind, since he was able to survive the disastrous ending of his rival without losing his own position.

9. Acts viii. 12, 13 gives this as the summary of Philip's message. It is difficult to suppose that Simon's acceptance of Christianity meant much more than the barest minimum that Philip could regard as the faith necessary for baptism; but it will be seen below that the minimum which S. Paul was prepared to accept was very small indeed, and there is no reason to suppose that Philip was more particular. It is however possible that Simon's system, in so far as it is attributable to him rather than his followers, was of later development, and that he was at the moment of his baptism genuinely convinced of the truth of Philip's message.

10. For the explanation of the failure of the Hebrew Christians to realize the nature of S. Stephen's teaching cf. c. II. nn. 2 and 6.

11. See above, n. 4 *ad fin.*, for the fact that Galilean Jews were particularly exposed to the hostility of the Samaritans.

12. We have no direct account of any controversy among the Christians of Jerusalem as to the admission of Samaritans to the Church. On the other hand in view of the violent controversy excited by the proposal to admit Gentiles to the Church, except as proselytes of Judaism, it would be surprising if the wholesale baptism of Samaritans were accepted without opposition, especially at a time when such admissions were bound to react unfavourably on the position of Hebrew Christians, who by fraternizing with Samaritans would certainly make themselves unpopular with their Jewish brethren.

Thus it would almost be legitimate to conjecture that there was a controversy on this occasion, even if no evidence of any kind survived on the matter. In fact, however, there are indirect traces of it in the N.T., which, when taken in conjunction, seem to point fairly decisively to a controversy having taken place on the lines reconstructed in the text.

(*a*) Mt. x. 5^b. The survival of this introduction to the charge given by Our Lord to the Twelve in S. Matthew suggests that it was used, in a thoroughly rabbinical manner, to prove that Samaritans and Gentiles could not enter the Church, at any rate until all Israel had been brought in. There is no reason to suppose that it was not in fact part of Our Lord's original charge to the Twelve on this occasion; but its survival in a Gospel only compiled, at any rate in its final form, long after both questions were settled, seems to show that it had at one time a controversial value. (Naturally it might have been invented for the purposes of the controversy, in

which case it would furnish decisive evidence that a controversy did in fact take place; but it seems at least equally probable that it is genuine.) A similar consideration applies to the incident recorded in Lk. ix. 51. The incident indeed might be interpreted in two ways, since it might be argued either that Our Lord had already been rejected by the Samaritans once, or that He had, by refusing to destroy them by fire, shown that they were capable of salvation. In this case the ambiguity of the story tells in favour of its authenticity; but again it seems probable that its survival is due to the fact that it was discussed as a relevant precedent at the time when the admission of Samaritans to the Church was a matter of controversy.

(*b*) The language in which S. Luke describes the conversions at Samaria affords on close investigation certain traces of such a controversy. Thus in Acts viii. 14 *seqq.*, the whole mission of SS. Peter and John, the two chief members of the Twelve, suggests that the matter is one of grave importance, and closely resembles the language of xi. 22, where a similar mission is sent to deal with a difficult situation (see below, c. v. § i. nn. 11, 16). Further, on their arrival, they are described as "praying for the Samaritans that they might receive the Holy Ghost." The phrase is suggestive, since elsewhere the imposition of hands is an authoritative action, by which the Holy Ghost is conveyed, the prayers which presumably accompanied it being regarded as accessory. Cf. ix. 17, xix. 6, and 1 Tim. iv. 14, 2 i. 6. The mention of the fact that the Apostles pray that the Samaritans may receive the Holy Ghost, and also of the fact that the Holy Ghost is given in the form of an impressive outward manifestation, seems to indicate that there was some doubt in the Apostles' mind whether in fact Samaritans were capable of receiving the gift at all. (Cf. c. 1. Appendix on Spiritual Gifts.) Further we are informed that on their return the Apostles preach in the villages of the Samaritans (*v.* 25); apparently they had not done so on their way to Sebaste. It would seem that in the case of the Samaritans as in that of Cornelius there was considerable doubt; and that this doubt was voiced by a section of the Church of Jerusalem is indicated by the passages already quoted in (*a*). This is further confirmed by Acts xv. 3, where SS. Paul and Barnabas on their way through Phoenicia and Samaria announce to the local Christians the conversion of the Gentiles and are greeted with enthusiasm. We are not told that they made any such announcement on their journey through Judaea, or that it met with any such reception. The inference would seem to be that the Samaritan Christians, although circumcised and probably continuing to observe the Law, definitely side with the Gentiles against the Church of Jerusalem. This suggests that even some twelve years after the first evangelization of Samaria there was still a good deal of friction between Jewish and Samaritan Christians, and such a state of feeling can hardly be attributed to anything but the exclusiveness of a certain element among the Hebrews. This exclusiveness, in view of the attitude of the Hebrews in the case of Cornelius, would naturally make itself felt as soon as the news of their conversion was announced.

(*c*) The incident of Jno. iv, although its historicity is more easily open to question than that of the saying of Mk. x. 5^b and the episode of Lk. ix. 51, is of considerable importance, since it seems to contain in *v.* 21 an account of the actual decision which must have been accepted in practice, in regard to the problem created by the fact that the Samaritans prior to their conversion had worshipped on Mount Gerizim (see n. 18). On the other hand the Gospel in its final form can hardly have been published until long after the relation of the two Temples had ceased to be a matter of practical interest. The incident itself seems to give a good account as to the relation of Jews and Samaritans, yet it is hardly likely that the point was one which would have much interest for Christians outside Palestine. Here, as in the narrative of the Passion and the part played in it by the Sanhedrin, we seem to have an element of information which would scarcely be possessed by and would certainly not seem worth recording to anyone who had not been familiar with the Church in Jerusalem during the years immediately following the Crucifixion (cf. c. 1. nn. 16, 18 and c. 11. Appendix). Thus it seems probable that in the narrative of Jno. iv we have a reflection of the course of the controversy excited by the admission of Samaritans to the Church, derived from the memories of one who took part in it. There is no reason to suppose that it may not recount a genuine incident

in the life of Our Lord, though it is probable that it has been much elaborated. These questions however belong to the whole treatment of the Fourth Gospel.

The above evidence when taken as a whole seems to justify the reconstruction of the controversy given in the text. The fact that S. Luke does not record it explicitly is not surprising. The issues involved in it were similar to those involved in the controversy over the admission of the Gentiles, but of less importance. They were of no great interest to Gentile readers, and could therefore be omitted without loss to his narrative.

13. See the references in n. 7.

14. Acts viii. 15 *seqq.*, x. 44 *seqq.*, xi. 15 *seqq.* (note esp. *v.* 18), xix. 2, show that the receiving of the Holy Ghost is necessary for obtaining full membership of the Christian community. How far it was regarded as a matter of course that the gift would be accompanied by external manifestations is less certain. See c. 1. Appendix on Spiritual Gifts.

15. See the references in n. 4, from which it is clear that the Samaritans definitely claimed that their Temple was the only true one. Thus they could not continue to worship there without condemning the Hebrews for worshipping at Jerusalem.

16. This was presumably the purpose of Simon's offer, which reveals in any case a very peculiar conception of Christianity. It would seem that Philip had taught that Our Lord would come and set up a Messianic kingdom, but that Simon, like the sons of Zebedee in Mk x. 35, expected it to be, at any rate at the outset, an earthly kingdom, in which he might hope to secure a leading part.

17. This can only be conjectured, but it is possible that Simon had heard that certain early benefactors of the Church did in fact hold a high position at Jerusalem, and inferred that they had bought it (cf. c. 1. n. 37).

18. See above, n. 12 (*c*). In any case it is difficult to see how the Hebrews, including as they did a certain number of Pharisees, should have agreed to tolerate the Samaritans on any other basis. For the existence of synagogues among the Samaritans cf. Epiph. *Haer.* lxxx. 1. It is to be presumed that Samaritan Christians would continue to attend them, in the same way as the Hebrew Christians did. Their failure to observe the worship of Mount Gerizim would presumably prejudice their reputation for piety among their Samaritan neighbours, but it is perhaps doubtful whether the Samaritans possessed the same zeal for that Temple as the Jews did for the Temple at Jerusalem. It must be remembered that even among the Jews the whole population did not go up to Jerusalem for the festivals (Jno. vii. 1–14, xi. 56). Consequently it seems probable that the Samaritan Christians could abstain from worshipping at the national Temple without necessarily exposing themselves to persecution; though it is probable that they had to face a considerable amount of it. The fact that Christianity was of Jewish origin would not predispose the general public of Samaria in its favour.

19. It may be presumed from the career of Philip that he sympathised with S. Stephen's rejection of the Jewish system, and that consequently his Samaritan converts would not be taught to set any great store by the religious observances in which they had been educated.

20. The fact that Samaritans were not bound to worship at Jerusalem—and it would have been practically impossible for them to do so without separating themselves from their fellow-countrymen—implied that the Jewish system was not an essential part of the Christian dispensation. It is not improbable that Jno. iv. 23 contains a reminiscence of an argument drawn from the precedent of the Samaritans for application to the question of Gentile converts.

§ ii. THE RE-ORGANIZATION

The labours of Philip were not confined to his mission to Samaria. He returned to Jerusalem at the ending of the persecution; but soon afterwards, without any similar necessity, he felt called to leave the city and to continue his career as a preacher of Christianity in regions

where it was as yet unknown. At the bidding, as he believed, of an angelic messenger[1], he proceeded towards the cities of the Philistine coast, meeting on his way an Ethiopian eunuch, already an admirer of the Jewish faith, and willing to accept Philip's interpretation of the teaching of its prophets[2]. The eunuch was baptized, and Philip proceeded on his way to Azotus, and thence journeyed northwards, preaching as he went, until he came to Caesarea, the capital of the Roman province of Judaea. The size of the city and its political importance made it a valuable centre for the evangelization of the Jewish nation, while it was also a convenient refuge against future persecutions and offered easy access to Philip's friends at Samaria[3]. His action in deciding to leave Jerusalem was typical of that of many others of the Hellenist converts[4]. However little they had to fear from acts of overt violence, life in the city had in fact been rendered impossible by the course of events which had led to the martyrdom of Stephen. The Hellenist synagogues would no longer tolerate the preaching, probably not even the presence, of known supporters of the blasphemies which had cost him his life[5]. The whole system of the Temple-worship had lost its appeal for men who saw in it the embodiment of a religious outlook that was at best already obsolete, even if it had not from the first been due to the failure of the nation to realize the true spiritual meaning of its calling. The religious life of the Hebrew Christians was too much concerned with a devout observance of the old Jewish system to provide a congenial atmosphere for those who held that the Church should cut herself loose from the fetters of the past and seek to bring all nations to the knowledge of the truth revealed to her. The Hebrews showed no inclination to accept this standpoint, and although they had never formally repudiated the teaching of Stephen, it was certain that a continued preaching of his doctrines would arouse vigorous opposition[6].

Thus the Hellenist could find little to attract him in the religious life of the city; and religious isolation meant to a large extent social isolation as well. Exclusion from the Hellenist synagogues implied exclusion from all social relations with the members of those organizations[7]; while the atmosphere of the Church left no room for any distinction between religious and social life. The circle of Hellenist Christians had been scattered by the persecution; and the isolated members who returned would find among the Hebrews few Christians who shared their doctrines. Thus in the majority of cases the leading members of the party which had followed Stephen did not return to

Jerusalem, where they would be cut off alike from Hellenist Jews and Hebrew Christians, or, if they returned, found no permanent home there.

Meanwhile the missionary activities which had accompanied their flight had confronted the Church with a new problem. The refugees had seized the opportunity of preaching the Gospel with all the enthusiasm natural to new converts suffering persecution for the faith. Thus, even apart from the serious question of principle involved in the preaching of Philip at Samaria, and the far more serious questions which were soon to be brought to light, the Gospel had been preached and converts had been made in the outlying districts of Judaea and Galilee[8].

Naturally such converts could not be expected to leave their homes and unite themselves to the existing community in Jerusalem. On the other hand they were too numerous to be left, as had been the case with the older converts who were unable to reside permanently in Jerusalem, without any provision for specifically Christian worship[9]. Isolated disciples might be left to worship in the local Jewish synagogues; but where there was already a numerous body of Christians it would be necessary to provide them with facilities for practising those rites which were part of the new revelation. This necessity involved the organization of new bodies outside the Mother-Church. As members of such local bodies the new converts could receive those benefits of their faith which had hitherto only been available for the Christians of Jerusalem, except in so far as those resident elsewhere had been able, on the occasion of their visits to the Temple for the great festivals of the national religion, to join in the worship and common life of their brethren in the city[10].

It was necessary therefore to provide in such local groups of Christians for the holding of the common meal with its solemn eucharistic termination[11], as well as for such meetings as might seem desirable for the exercise of those spiritual gifts whose manifestation was regarded as a normal part of the Christian life[12]. Apart from these matters however the new converts stood in considerable need of supervision. Their original evangelists, in their enthusiasm for preaching the Gospel, had not in all cases considered the need for impressing on their converts the responsibilities attaching to the new faith, and the true nature of the Messianic kingdom. Among devout observers of the Law, who had already been expecting the "consolation of Israel" interpreted in a religious sense, such precautions would be little needed; but it was possible that many of the new converts would be very different in character[13].

For these reasons it was imperative that the rulers of the Christian body should provide for the more or less constant supervision of the new societies. They alone had the power to convey those gifts of the Holy Ghost without which the members could not be regarded as being in the full sense Christians[14]. The power to heal sickness, also regarded as part of the new faith, was in general confined to them, though in certain cases it had been vouchsafed to others[15]. They could bear the most conclusive testimony to the earthly ministry and Resurrection of the Lord, and could also give an authoritative account of the moral and religious teaching which He had laid down during His earthly life[16]. Further as rulers of the society, it was their duty to provide for the control and guidance of the worship of the local communities and to choose suitable persons for these tasks, which included the duty of presiding at the common meal and the eucharistic worship of the Church[17].

It would indeed have been possible to entrust the work to Christians of Jerusalem appointed for the purpose; but such representatives could not give such authoritative witness as the Twelve to the life and teaching of the Lord or to the fact of His Resurrection. Further the Twelve and a certain number of the original Galilean disciples were likely to be more acceptable to the converts of the outlying regions of Judaea and Galilee than were the Christians of the city. In Galilee such men might cause friction by their tendency to claim a certain superiority over those born outside Judaea[18]; while those among the leading Christians of Jerusalem who belonged to the more definitely Pharisaical section of the community would hardly be suitable for a mission to the common people whom they despised for their carelessness in observing the Law[19].

Accordingly as the need arose the Twelve normally working in couples left the city to supervise the growth of the new communities[20]. Their duties included the appointment of local rulers, the laying of hands on those baptized, and the instruction of the converts in the duties of their profession. In a country continually disturbed by the appearance of false claimants to the Messianic title, it was constantly necessary to secure them from being led astray by false Christs, whose language closely resembled a certain strain of Christian teaching[21]. At the same time the regions untouched by the first refugees offered a field of labour which could not be neglected. The Apostles preached in the villages through which they passed, and those already converted handed on the good news to their neighbours, so that the first groups of converts could not fail to reproduce

themselves with considerable rapidity. Thus in the years following the first extension of the faith outside Jerusalem the Twelve were to a growing extent forced to separate themselves from the city and to devote their attention to the propagation of the Gospel in the villages of Palestine, and to the consolidation of the faith of the new converts. The general supervision of the whole of their labours lay with Peter, assisted by John[22].

The new Churches made no attempt to reproduce the communism originally practised in Jerusalem. At the same time the converts were expected to care for the needs of their poorer brethren and to support the helpless[23]. A large part of their religious life was still common to them and the rest of the nation, since the worship of the synagogue was still binding on them as Jews, and also offered opportunities of reaching the ears of the general public[24]. To this worship was added the observance of the rites peculiar to the Christian sect. The daily common meal and Eucharist of the Church of Jerusalem could hardly be continued among the peasantry of Judaea and Galilee, and these rites, accompanied by preaching of a prophetic kind and other manifestations of the Spirit, inevitably became weekly observances of a more exclusively religious character, which took place naturally after the close of the Sabbath, when the Jewish worship of the day was over and the labours of the new week were not yet begun, at the very time of the week which had marked the Resurrection of the Lord[25]. For the rest the converts were devout Jews, sharing the zeal of the nation for the Law[26], and in danger of being led into the turmoil of agitation which was continually affecting the country. Soon their charity and simplicity were certain to expose them also to the deceptions of those who had learnt enough of their beliefs to make a living by assuming the rôle of Christian prophets and teachers[27].

This entirely unpremeditated expansion of the Church had the result of changing completely the relations of the Apostolic college to the Christians of Jerusalem. Hitherto they had been a body of teachers residing permanently in the city, proclaiming their doctrines in the Temple, and able, in virtue of their prestige as the chosen disciples of the Master, to rule a society which numbered among its members several who, from the Jewish point of view, had far higher claims to consideration. But the growth of Christian communities in other parts of Palestine involved a continual increase of the number of occasions on which it was necessary for them to leave Jerusalem, until their absences, at first only incidental, developed into a more

or less regular system of journeys throughout Judaea and Galilee, varied by periodical visits to the Mother-Church for the solving of particular difficulties, or the observance of the festivals of the national religion[28]. This process was bound to react on the Church in Jerusalem itself. The absence of the original rulers increased the influence of the older disciples of the city, who inevitably succeeded to the duties which the Twelve were no longer able to fulfil. Of these some were, like the Twelve, Galileans, who had followed, though not with so close an intimacy, the earthly ministry of Jesus[29]. Since, however, they had not been among the chosen band of His disciples, they had far less claim to consideration; and there were among the converts of Jerusalem some who could claim with equal right the privilege of having seen the Lord in the flesh and witnessed His Resurrection[30]. In this respect they were the equals of any Galileans except the Twelve, while at Jerusalem they naturally enjoyed a greater measure of consideration than the less eminent Galilean disciples. In general except for the Twelve the relative importance of those who had seen the Lord depended in the main on their personal gifts, whether of spiritual powers, learning or piety[31]. Others again were reverenced for their sufferings in the recent persecution[32].

In view however of the respect and admiration entertained by all devout Jews for those who observed the Law with the scrupulous zeal of the Pharisees it was inevitable that converts who followed the principles of that sect should attain to prominence in the community, when the persecution had eliminated those elements which tended to a liberal view as to the meaning of the Law and the obligation of observing it. So long indeed as the Twelve remained in Jerusalem their influence had to a certain extent counteracted that of the Pharisees, for they had inherited that opposition of their Master to the Pharisaical point of view, which had appealed so strongly to the populace of Galilee[33]. Their removal from the city involved a considerable increase of the influence of the Pharisaical element in the Church.

Among those marked out as pre-eminently qualified to succeed the Twelve in the government of the community was James the Lord's brother. He had been a witness, somewhat sceptical and unconvinced, of the earthly career of Jesus[34], but he had been favoured with a special vision of Him after His Resurrection. The result had been to convince him that Jesus, in spite of His revolt against the increasingly legalist tendencies of the accredited religious leaders of the nation, was none the less the Messiah. James himself had, like

Jesus, been brought up in the earlier traditions of Pharisaical piety[35], but he had not joined in His revolt against the later developments of Pharisaism,—a revolt which had indeed mainly attracted the sympathies of the less religious elements in Galilee and Judaea. Nor did his subsequent acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah lessen his devotion to the general system of Pharisaic teaching[36]. Reinforced by the new motives of the certainty of the Resurrection of the dead, as guaranteed by the Resurrection of Jesus, and the imminence of the Messianic kingdom, that system could form the basis of a sternly ascetic piety. By means of this system the Chosen People of God could prepare themselves to endure the sufferings that must precede the establishment of the kingdom, and make themselves secure of a share in its reward. The effect of Christianity was indeed to transfer the emphasis of his Pharisaism from the observance of the letter of the Law to the endeavour to attain to personal holiness, and thus to restore in him the outlook of an earlier generation of Pharisaism; but none the less the essential outlines of Pharisaism remained. It was still an attempt to attain to personal holiness, in which the observance of external rules, often in a somewhat pedantic sense, played a leading part[37]. The general ideal of holiness as taught by Jesus was the logical deduction from the noblest ideals of the earlier Pharisees, and it was thus possible for James to combine the Christian and the Pharisaic ideals without inconsistency[38], although the acceptance of the teaching of Jesus withheld him from condemning those who believed that the new teaching had superseded the necessity of that accurate observance of outward forms which he continued to practise[39]. And it could not be denied that such a piety as his was eminently calculated to attract to belief in Jesus all the most religious elements of the nation.

Thus next to the Twelve James rose to an unchallenged pre-eminence among the Christians of Jerusalem, and as their visits to the city became rarer he gradually assumed a position inferior only to that of Peter and John[40]. His piety in the eyes of the Jewish world outweighed any disadvantages that his Galilean origin might have entailed; and it weighed no less with that section of it which had embraced the new creed. For them, moreover, it was impossible to despise as a Galilean one who was by birth connected with the Lord Himself; other Galileans might be prejudiced by their origin, but in the case of James it could only increase his authority[41]. Thus he was able to assume a position in which he became in fact, though not yet in name, the ruler of the community. At the same time his position as a Pharisee ensured for him the protection of a powerful

section of the Sanhedrin. The Pharisaic wing of that body had already declined to sanction a general policy of persecution; and they would be still less likely to do so when its recognized leader was himself a Pharisee[42]. That protection might not always extend itself to the whole Christian community; but the Pharisees had too strong a solidarity among themselves to allow the authorities to attack one of their own number. Thus James and his personal followers could hope for an immunity from persecution which the community in its earlier days had not possessed. At present the need of a formal change of system was not felt; but in practice the actual rulership of the Church in Jerusalem tended to fall increasingly on the chief of the Christian Pharisees.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III, SECTION II

1. Philip, with whom S. Luke was personally acquainted, is presumably the authority for the incidents of Acts viii. The vagueness of the narrative and the incidents of *vv.* 26 and 39 seem to show that he was peculiarly susceptible to that sense of overwhelming spiritual constraint which was regarded as due to the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and which might on occasion assume the form of an apparently external vision. It is however only reasonable to suppose that such visions were in many cases a confirmation of an already existing conviction that the course indicated was the right one to pursue, a conviction of which indeed he might not as yet have become explicitly conscious. It is therefore reasonable to investigate the considerations which would in any case have inclined him to the course which he in fact followed in the belief that he was commanded to do so by divine authority. Such an investigation does not of course imply that he was mistaken in believing that he was acting under supernatural inspiration, or that his visions were in any sense delusions.

2. Deut. xxiii. 1 excludes all eunuchs from the worship of Israel, but it would seem from Is. lvi. 3 that relaxations were made later, presumably in favour of influential supporters in the neighbouring kingdoms (cf. Wisd. iii. 14). Thus his visit may have been due to personal devotion to Judaism.

It is however possible that the eunuch had come as an emissary of Candace, since it was by no means unusual for influential Gentiles to make presents to the Temple at Jerusalem. Cf. *Ps. Arist.* 33, *Antt.* XVI. ii. 1, *B.J.* V. xiii. 6, Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 37, 40 (M. II. 589, 592). It is perhaps probable that the eunuch was sent on some such mission, a fact which would explain both his interest in the Jewish Scriptures and his apparent unfamiliarity with them.

3. It is possible that Philip had hopes of preaching to the Gentiles on his journey from Azotus to Caesarea, but if so, it seems likely that he was disappointed. The districts through which he passed contained indeed a very mixed population. Thus in 63 B.C. Pompey treated Azotus, Jamnia and Joppa, and also Caesarea and Dora further north, as Greek cities and made them independent of Jerusalem. Josephus admits that his action was justifiable (*B.J.* I. vii. 7, τοῖς γνησίοις ἀποδοὺς πολίταις, *Antt.* XIV. iv. 4, τοῖς οἰκήτορσιν ἀπέδωκε). They were united to the province of Syria, but subsequently granted to Herod the Great by Augustus (XV. vii. 3). On his death Caesarea and Joppa were left to Archelaus, some of the admittedly Greek cities including Gaza being re-attached to Syria (XVII. xi. 4). Joppa would seem to have been the most Jewish of these cities (Simon Maccabaeus had indeed expelled the Gentiles about 140 B.C.), but Pompey's treatment of it shows that there was a large Gentile element. The most purely Jewish place on the line of Philip's

journey was Lydda, which was the centre of one of the toparchies of Judaea, and remained a village dependent on Jerusalem (*B.J.* II. xix. 1).

While however there was a large Gentile population in these regions, it was hardly likely to be influenced by Philip's preaching. The Gentiles in these parts lived on terms of the utmost hostility with their Jewish neighbours, a hostility which at Joppa dated from the early years of the Maccabean era (2 Macc. xii. 3 *seqq.*). The hostility was natural, since in the eyes of the Jews the Gentiles resident in these parts were intruders on the soil of the Holy Land, in which they had no right to own the soil (*'Aboda Zara* i. 8, cf. *Life and Times*, I. 86 *seqq.*). At the present period outrages on the Jewish religion on the part of the Gentiles were by no means rare. Cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 30 (M. II. 575, 576), for the state of feeling at Jamnia and Ascalon, and *Antt.* XIX. vi. 3 for Dora. The quarrel was fiercest at Caesarea, where the Jews and Greeks were in a state of perpetual feud over the question whether the city was Jewish or Gentile. Nero decided in favour of the Gentiles, and the riots and outrages which resulted from his decision formed one of the grievances which gave the signal for the outbreak of the rebellion (*Antt.* XX. viii. 7, *B.J.* II. xiii. 7, xiv. 4 *seqq.*, and cf. III. ix. 1). Cf. *B.J.* II. xviii for the massacres of Jews and Gentiles in these mixed cities at the outbreak of the rebellion.

Thus the district through which Philip went was not very favourable if he had any hopes of converting the Gentiles. They would probably not listen to any religious teaching of Jewish origin, especially one which condemned no less than Judaism the worship of the idols which formed a symbol of the ancient quarrel. Nor were there likely to be many proselytes in the synagogues. Further the Jews, although in daily contact with Greek neighbours, were not as a rule much influenced by Greek ideas, which they would regard with the same hatred which they felt for their Greek neighbours. It would seem that Judaism was far more open to Greek influences in Jerusalem than at Caesarea.

Hence it is not surprising that the first Gentile convert made in these parts was Cornelius, a centurion apparently of Italian origin (see below, c. IV. § ii. n. 6). Possibly Philip was not familiar with these parts and hoped to find there a more or less hellenized Judaism, similar to that of the synagogues of the Dispersion. More probably however he had no definite idea of preaching to the Gentiles and simply desired to find a Jewish audience outside Jerusalem, and also possibly to be near Samaria. Since he is still there in Acts xxi. 8 it is possible that he made Caesarea his permanent headquarters, although, from the fact that he is not mentioned in Acts x, xi, it might seem that he only stayed there for a brief period. It is however quite in accordance with S. Luke's method to ignore the movements of his characters when they are not the main subject of interest. On the whole, therefore, it is probable that his main residence was Caesarea, and that he founded a mainly Jewish community in the city.

4. It is to be noted that S. Barnabas, although a Hellenist, and apparently to a certain extent in sympathy with the specifically Hellenist point of view, remains in Jerusalem, and is considered by the local Church to be a suitable person to deal with the situation at Antioch (see c. V. § i. n. 14). It would seem that he was more in sympathy with the older school of Christians at Jerusalem, and that he did not himself advocate the doctrines of S. Stephen, although he was to some extent influenced by them. In general he must however, prior to his visit to Antioch, be regarded as a rather liberal-minded Hebrew, so far as his doctrinal views are concerned. It is of course probable that there were many Hellenists whose attitude was the same, especially among the poorer class, which depended on the bounty of the Church. These are not covered by the account given of the Hellenists in this Chapter.

On the other hand it is probable that many of the Hellenists settled in Judaea among their own converts. It is clear that the original evangelists of Antioch made their permanent home there, at least until they were led to go further afield as a result of their success at Antioch (cf. Acts xi. 19 and xiii. 1, and see below, c. IV. § ii. n. 68). It seems likely therefore that the movements of S. Philip after his return from Samaria are to be regarded as typical of those of the Hellenists who were disciples of S. Stephen, and that these disciples in general did not return to

Jerusalem or made no permanent stay there. This view is supported by the fact that we hear of no effective opposition from the Hellenist side to the attitude of the party of circumcision. Christianity at Jerusalem becomes narrower in its outlook as the Church develops.

5. Cf. their attitude to S. Paul in Acts ix. 29.

6. It would not have been difficult to conjecture, in view of the subsequent attitude of the Hebrew Christians, that they would vigorously oppose the general lines of the teaching of Stephen. It is indeed possible that there had already been a controversy as to the conditions on which Gentiles might be admitted to membership of the Church. Strictly speaking, it is implied in Acts x. 45 and xi. 2 that there had in fact been a controversy on the matter. The use of the phrase οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς should imply an already existing party, opposed to the admission of the Gentiles without circumcision. Such a party might have arisen earlier as a result of academic debates between Hebrews and Hellenists as to the admission of Gentiles, or out of the case of the conversion of some Gentile admirer of the Jewish faith who had not been circumcised before his conversion, and was circumcised before baptism in spite of Hellenist opposition. That S. Luke should omit all reference to any such incident is no more remarkable than his similar silence in the case of Titus. On the other hand it is possible that S. Luke simply intends this passage as the first reference to the party afterwards known as the party of circumcision (though this is hardly in accordance with his usual method), or else that he uses a very inaccurate phrase to describe the persons who originally opposed the admission of the Samaritans and subsequently that of the Gentiles. (The question of circumcision did not of course arise in the case of the Samaritans.) On the whole it is easiest to suppose that the question had in fact already arisen, and that a party of circumcision existed before the baptism of Cornelius; but this view can only be advanced as a conjecture.

7. There can be no question of a general exclusion of Christians from the Jewish synagogues at this period (Acts ix. 2, xxi. 20, xxii. 19, xxvi. 11, Jas ii. 2, on which see below, n. 24). The sufferings of Hebrew Christians from the authorities of the nation as reflected in Mk and Mt. do not include this form of punishment (Mt. x. 17, xxiii. 34[b], a text peculiar to S. Matthew and probably suggested or remembered as a result of actual experience, Mk xiii. 9), presumably because the authors only record those warnings of Our Lord, the fulfilment of which was a matter of daily experience. On the other hand it is prophesied by Our Lord in Lk. vi. 22, the readers of which would be familiar with the complete separation of Jews and Christians common in the cities where S. Paul had preached. Of its application in the Hellenist synagogues in Jerusalem we have no direct evidence; but it is noticeable that it is mentioned three times in the Fourth Gospel as a form of punishment used against Our Lord's followers, or foretold by Him (ix. 22, xii. 42, xvi. 2). It is possible that this is a reminiscence of the practice as employed in the Dispersion; but it is at least possible that we have here a reminiscence of the fate which befell the Hellenist Christians in Jerusalem, and is another sign that this Gospel embodies the reminiscences of one who was familiar with Jerusalem at this period, and who clearly sympathised with Hellenist Christianity (cf. § i. n. 12 (*c*)). It is in any case almost incredible that these synagogues should have tolerated the presence of disciples of S. Stephen, who continued to hold and expound their master's views.

For the effects of such excommunication cf. *G.J.V.* II. 507 *seqq.*, and for its rabbinical elaborations *Hor. Hebr.* on 1 Cor. v. 5. In its strictest form it included confiscation of goods, beating in the synagogue, and separation from social intercourse, none being allowed to sit within four cubits of the person under excommunication, except his own family. The separation of persons from social intercourse, as practised in the early Church, seems to be derived from the Jewish practice as regards persons either formally excommunicated, or regarded as being in the same condition (cf. Mt. xviii. 17, which is explained by the incident of ix. 9 *seqq.*, 1 Cor. v. 9 *seqq.*, 2 Thess. iii. 10, 14). The use of this punishment would be more needed in practice than in theory, since the inability of the Jews to inflict the death-penalty would leave them no other means of punishing many offences for which the Law prescribed death.

8. For the reasons explained in c. II. n. 45 it is probable that the refugees could remain unmolested in the outlying regions of Judaea, as safely as in Galilee. In Acts ix. 32 the Churches we read of are at Lydda and Joppa, and are perhaps due to Philip's activities. In Gal. i. 22 it is possible for S. Paul to stay in Jerusalem without becoming known to the Churches of Judaea. The inference seems to be that for the reasons given in the note referred to the first Churches founded in Judaea were in the outlying districts, and that the villages near Jerusalem, but not so close as to be practically suburbs, were in fact evangelized later. Cf. also c. I. nn. 2 and 38.

9. Hitherto we have no record of the existence of any organized bodies of disciples, which first appear in Acts ix. 31. The inference is that hitherto isolated disciples had been left to worship in the synagogues, but that it has by now grown necessary to form "churches." This involves a complete change in the nature of the Church, which has hitherto been essentially a society of devout Jews living in Jerusalem. A wholesale migration of the new converts to Jerusalem would have been out of the question, assuming their numbers to have been at all considerable; and in any case such a migration would have been impossible for the Samaritans. Hence we have to deal with the extension of the Church from a single body, with a few loosely attached members living at a distance, into a number of communities scattered over the whole of Judaea, Samaria and Galilee, and the process by which the transformation was effected. In view of the lack of evidence it is necessary in several points to conjecture the probable course of the transformation.

10. It is to be presumed that such isolated disciples living outside Jerusalem, in so far as their profession of Christianity was definite enough to bring them to baptism (see c. I. n. 40), would be admitted to the common meal of the Church and the Eucharist on the occasion of their visits to Jerusalem, whether for the purpose of observing the Jewish festivals or on matters of business. Cf. Acts xxi. 20, where the rulers of the Church in Jerusalem are familiar with the feelings of the Jewish Christians assembled for Pentecost in Jerusalem.

It is somewhat remarkable that no attempt had been made before this to evangelize Judaea and Galilee. The reasons can only be conjectured. It is possible that the Twelve had found that the city itself provided them with so many openings for work that the task of extending the Church elsewhere seemed impracticable, and that they felt it their duty not to leave the city until their work in it was finished. To a certain extent this course would be necessary, since they might well hesitate to leave a large number of converts recently made, until they had provided for their supervision by disciples who could be relied on. It must also be remembered that Jerusalem was a centre from which they could hope to influence the Jewish nation throughout the world, and it may have seemed that the best course was to preach in the city and trust that the Gospel would in time be diffused throughout the whole of the Dispersion. In this case it is to be supposed that as yet there were not sufficient converts in any one place to make it desirable to form a community there. It is also possible that the return of the Lord was expected to happen so shortly that it seemed unnecessary to form any policy for propagating the Gospel, or to do more than preach from day to day, while awaiting the end (cf. Mt. x. 23). There is indeed a tradition that Our Lord commanded the Twelve to remain twelve years in the city, but this is probably due to the ascription to a command of Our Lord of the actual conduct of the Twelve (see below, c. V. § ii. n. 15).

It must in any case be remembered that the method pursued by S. Paul and the Hellenists of making converts rapidly and baptizing them after little preliminary instruction and without much care for their further supervision did in fact produce serious difficulties, and that a rapid multiplication of more or less nominal Christians in Judaea at this period might not have been a benefit to the future development of the Church.

11. The daily "breaking of bread," which had been a feature of the life of the community in Jerusalem in its earliest stages, would seem to have ceased by this time (c. II. n. 1). It is probable that it had already assumed the form of a weekly meal, followed by the Eucharist, when it was first introduced to the first local Churches of Palestine, but there is no direct evidence. See Appendix on the Primitive Eucharist.

12. It would seem that there are joint meetings for worship at Corinth apart from the Eucharist, at which speaking with tongues and prophesying play a prominent part, and it is probable that these were also to be found in Palestine. This, however, is not certain, since it is possible that these meetings at Corinth took the place of the worship of the synagogue from which the Corinthian Christians were excluded, and that in Palestine the Eucharist would normally form the only specifically Christian service, other forms of worship being common to the Church and the synagogue. The balance of probability seems however to favour the view given in the text.

13. Cf. § i. n. 9. It is clear that Philip had at Samaria accepted Simon with very little trouble to instruct him in the meaning of Christianity as a moral system, while his methods as described in Acts viii. 36 *seqq.* might easily lead to serious difficulties if applied to a considerable body of new converts. It is to be remembered that in Galilee there would be many who had been affected by Our Lord's original preaching, who were by no means remarkable for their piety (cf. c. i. n. 46). It is reasonable to suppose that these people would form a large element among the new converts. The mere fact that they had heard some part of Our Lord's teaching and witnessed some of His miracles would not necessarily imply that they had grasped the true nature of His message, or distinguished it from the other Messianic movements of the time. (See below, nn. 21 and 27, and for the devout believers of the period as represented in the circles in which Our Lord moved see n. 35.)

14. See Appendix on the Apostolate.

15. This seems to be implied in Acts ix. 32 *seqq.* and the language of S. Paul. (See Appendix on the Apostolate.) If so the manifestation of such gifts by S. Stephen and S. Philip was regarded as an exception. Apparently the passage of Acts ix. 32 *seqq.* is intended as a specimen of Apostolic activity at the period, and implies that S. Luke's authority for this passage regarded the healing of sickness as a normal part of it.

16. It is the ability to give evidence as an eye-witness of the actual life and teaching of Our Lord, and of His Resurrection, that is the essential element in the authority of the Apostles. (See Appendix on the Apostolate.)

17. "Presbyters" who manage the affairs of the local communities among the Christians of Palestine meet us in Jas v. 14, where apparently they anoint the sick person and pray for him in the absence of an Apostle who might be expected to deal with the sickness in a more authoritative manner. So in Heb. xiii. 17 the persons addressed are subject to rulers who are responsible for teaching and ruling them. At present the evidence of the *Didache* is under some suspicion in view of the investigations of Dr Armitage Robinson in *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache*. Whether or no it is a genuinely early document of the primitive Palestinian Church it seems to give a surprisingly probable account of these communities. We find ἐπίσκοποι and deacons in xv. 1, 2, who perform the same duties as the itinerant prophets of the preceding chapters, but their position has to be emphasized with some vigour owing to the tendency to despise them. This sounds very similar to the monition of the author of Hebrews, and suggests that the local communities are subject to rulers, whose normal duty is to preside at the Agape and the Eucharist (cf. x. 7, and Appendix on the Eucharist), but whose task is rendered somewhat difficult by the competition of teachers and prophets with more impressive personal gifts. Occasionally visits might even be received from an Apostle (xi. 3, and see below). It is at least likely that this is an accurate picture of the conditions of these Churches and the probability is enhanced by a consideration of the organization of worship in the synagogue. The government of these lay with a committee of elders, who in purely Jewish villages were also the elders of the place and responsible for its local government. The conduct of worship lay with the ἀρχισυνάγωγος or ruler of the synagogue. He was not indeed the minister in public worship, but was responsible for selecting readers and preachers from among the congregation. Normally he was one of the elders (*G.J.V.* II. 511 *seqq.*). There is even in Acts xiii. 15 a body of ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, who are, it may be conjectured, identical in this instance with the elders (perhaps S. Luke's terminology is inaccurate here). This method of organization lay ready to hand among the Christian communities of Palestine, and indeed it would in some cases have to be preserved, since we have

evidence of cases in which the synagogue as a whole is Christian (see n. 24). Here the old organization of the synagogue would have to be kept up, and it is hardly likely that a new Christian organization would be set up as well, since it would not be needed. In these cases the ἀρχισυνάγωγος, and elsewhere one of a body of Christian elders appointed for the oversight of the local converts, would naturally be responsible for presiding at the common meal, and it would fall on him, in the absence of any distinguished visitor, to conduct the act of eucharistic worship with which the meal would close. That this would harmonize with Jewish ideas is clear from *B.J.* II. viii. 5, in which Josephus describes the common meals of the Essenes. These begin and end with solemn prayers uttered by an official whom he calls the ἱερεύς. Thus it seems clear that the idea of entrusting the local Palestinian Churches to a body of elders, one of whom would at any given time be responsible for public worship, would be natural in the circumstances of the time. The elder responsible would probably be chosen from the whole college of elders in some kind of rotation. It may be noted that we have definite evidence at a later date of the use of the Jewish titles among the Palestinian Christians (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 18, πρεσβυτέρους γὰρ οἵτοι ἔχουσι καὶ ἀρχισυναγώγους). The use of these titles would seem to come down from a time when the village synagogue and the local Church were in fact identical. Thus it seems reasonable to hold that the Palestinian Churches were from the outset modelled on the synagogues, and in places identical with them, and that the original president at the local Eucharist was, in the absence of an Apostle, an elder analogous to the Jewish ἀρχισυνάγωγος. Further confirmation is supplied by the fact that such an arrangement seems also to be indicated in the earliest Pauline Churches (cf. c. VI. § i. n. 38). Presbyters would receive their office through the imposition of hands by the Apostles, accompanied by suitable prayers (see Appendix), though it is possible that they would be chosen by popular election (cf. Acts vi. 1–6).

18. See Jno. vii. 41, 52, for the attitude of the Jews of Jerusalem to Galileans, and cf. *B.J.* II. xx. 5 and xxi for the difficulty of dealing with Galilee through Judaeans. It is possible that the reason why the Twelve, who refuse to leave Jerusalem during the persecution, subsequently undertake the organization of the local Churches is that they could not entrust the task to the older Judaean converts on account of this antipathy and had not a sufficient number of Galilean converts of any standing to employ them for the purpose. This can only be conjectured, but the change of policy is curious.

19. Cf. c. I. n. 47.

20. In Acts viii. 14 the news of the conversion of Samaria comes to the Apostles in Jerusalem. In xi. 1, however, the conversion of Cornelius is reported to the Apostles and brethren κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, and in xi. 22, at a period which is not very much later, the news of the conversion of Gentiles at Antioch reaches the "Church in Jerusalem." That the variations of phrase are not accidental is shown by the fact that the response to the news varies in each case. In the first the Apostles proceed to send the two leaders of the Twelve; in the second a party in the Church of Jerusalem calls S. Peter to account for his action; in the third the Church of Jerusalem sends S. Barnabas down to investigate the facts and deal with them (see below, c. V. § i. n. 11). Whatever the qualifications of S. Barnabas may have been we should hardly expect him to go alone on a matter of such importance, in view of the action as regards Samaria.

It appears therefore that while in the first place the Apostles act on their own authority, in the later cases the community in Jerusalem acts independently of them. In the case of Cornelius a section of it is strong enough to call S. Peter to account; in the case of Antioch it hopes to settle the position of Gentile converts without him. The inference is that in the interval the Apostles have lost their control of the Church in Jerusalem; and the natural explanation is that they have ceased to reside there permanently. This explanation corresponds to the rest of the evidence. In Acts xii. 1 *seqq.* Herod seizes S. James, the son of Zebedee, and S. Peter, but no other of the Twelve. The obvious reason is that they are not in the city. We should expect them to be there for the Passover, but it is reasonable to suppose that Herod struck too soon, and that the rest were warned not to come up for the festival. Similarly in Gal. i and ii S. Paul pays two visits to Jerusalem.

On the first he finds resident in the city S. Peter and S. James, the Lord's brother; on the second, the same two and S. John, but apparently no more. In Acts xv. 4 they are all in Jerusalem, but by now they are distinguished from the local Church, and their presence is obviously due to the circumstances of the occasion. The place which they held in the early days of the Christian movement in Jerusalem has been taken in Acts xi. 30 by the presbyters, and in xii. 17 by James and the brethren.

Hence we have a quite consistent body of evidence to the effect that the Apostles were not in Jerusalem as a general rule from a period shortly after the conversion of the Samaritans. The only exception is ix. 27, and here we certainly have an error by S. Luke (see below). Further we have evidence that the reason for their absence was that they were actually engaged in organizing the local Churches of Palestine. Thus in Gal. i. 22 S. Paul states that he was unknown by face to the Churches in Judaea that were in Christ. Now the whole point of the passage is that his Gospel is something revealed to him, not something which he has learnt from others, as is proved by the smallness of his acquaintance with the Apostles. There can be no point in his saying that he was unknown by face to the Churches of Judaea, if by them he simply means the newly-made converts of Judaea, who could have told him far less than the ordinary Christian of Jerusalem. But here, as in other passages (see below, c. VI. § ii. n. 32), the term "the churches" is apparently used to describe the authorized rulers or representatives of the local communities, who are responsible for their management, and are more or less identified with them. Thus the Churches here are the rulers of the Churches, *i.e.* the rest of the Twelve, whom S. Paul has never met. Incidentally it may be noted that S. Luke in Acts ix. 28 actually describes the Apostles at this time as being engaged in going into and out of Jerusalem. It is possible that he uses the phrase in a loose manner, meaning "going about with them at Jerusalem," which is the sense given in the English versions. But it is to be noted that the phrase *εἰσπορεύεσθαι καὶ ἐκπορεύεσθαι* is used in 1 Macc. xiii. 49 and xv. 14 in a strictly literal sense of going in and out of a place that is besieged. Although S. Luke seems in any case to be mistaken as to the extent of S. Paul's acquaintance with the Apostles on this occasion, as is clear from a comparison of this passage with Gal. i, it is not impossible that the words are intended to convey the nature of the normal activity of the Twelve at the period. Certainly they seem to describe what it must actually have been. In any case they were not as S. Luke here suggests actually in Jerusalem, or S. Paul must have met them (see further, c. IV. § i. n. 46). In point of fact S. Paul knew so little of the Twelve except for the three whom he met on the occasion of the second of his visits that he never mentions one of them by name.

That the members of the Twelve normally worked in couples seems fairly certain. See Appendix on the Apostolate.

21. The warning of Mk xiii. 21 *seqq.* and the expanded and emphasized version of it which appears in Mt. xxiv. 11 and 23, and Lk. xvii. 20 *seqq.*, xxi. 8, would scarcely have been preserved in such fulness, if it had not been necessary to remind the converts of Palestine that Our Lord had consistently warned His disciples against having any part in the Messianic movements which occurred between His death and the fall of Jerusalem. For these movements cf. c. I. n. 10.

22. Cf. c. I. n. 33. In Acts ix. 32 *seqq.* we have apparently incidents of a general journey undertaken by S. Peter to supervise the Churches of Judaea. The words *διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων* can hardly bear any other meaning. It is somewhat peculiar that S. John is not with him, but it is not necessary to suppose that each pair of Apostles would necessarily remain together for the whole of a journey of visitation. Each might presumably take one half of the Churches in a particular region. In any case S. Peter was alone on this journey, which, since it ended at Caesarea, might well be remembered in circles with which S. Luke had personal acquaintance. See Appendix on the Apostolate for a further discussion of the association of SS. Peter and John.

23. It is of course impossible to be certain that no such attempts were made, but we have no evidence for them, and some for the reverse, which is implied in Acts ix. 36 *seqq.* and in the absence of any evidence of an attempt to imitate the Essenes in establishing a system of religious communities in a strict sense throughout Palestine. All the evidence as to the primitive Jewish Christians implies a retention of private property, with the obligation of providing for the support of the helpless (cf. Jas ii. 1–7 and 15, *Ep. Barn.* xxi. 2, Heb. xiii. 2, 5, 16). Since even Josephus

puts the number of the Essenes at only 4000 (*Antt.* XVIII. i. 5) it would seem that an attempt to reproduce their system would hardly have proved a great popular success. Cf. also *Didache* xiii.

24. Cf. n. 7. The most remarkable piece of evidence on this point is Jas ii. 1–7. Here the rich man is one of the class responsible for the persecution of the Church, yet he is found attending a Christian "synagogue." The explanation appears to be that in some places the whole congregation of the local synagogue has been converted to Christianity, or at least that a majority of its members, including the elders responsible for assigning the places of those present, are Christians. At the same time it is still meeting together for public worship as the local synagogue, and when it meets in this capacity, its worship varies so little from the normal worship of the synagogue that it is natural for unconverted Jews to attend it. The rich man is probably regarded as a member of the Sadducean aristocracy, who happens to be passing through the place in which the Christians control the synagogue. It is not unreasonable to suppose that this may have happened in certain cases in the villages of Judaea and Galilee; it seems to have happened in the case of one of the synagogues visited by S. Paul, that at Philippi (see below, c. VI. § iii. n. 21). For S. James' identification of the rich with the Sadducees cf. c. I. n. 14.

25. It may be assumed that the Ebionite practice of observing both the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday is a survival of the original practice (*H.E.* iii. 27). The close of the Sabbath at 6 p.m. would leave the Christians free to assemble for prayer for the rest of the evening and the night. As the early Jewish Christians appear to be mainly of the labouring class it is likely that the time chosen was originally due to economic necessities rather than to the desire to commemorate the Resurrection. But the coincidence would at once be regarded as having a religious significance.

For the general economic position of the early Jewish converts cf. Hegesippus quoted in *H.E.* iii. 20, Jas v. 4, and *Didache* xiii.

26. Acts xxi. 20, where ζηλωτής is a strong word, almost suggesting fanaticism. Cf. the use of it in Gal. i. 14.

27. See n. 21 and cf. the more general warning of Mt. vii. 15. The fact that the warnings against false Christs and false prophets are so strongly emphasized in S. Matthew shows that the danger was one which peculiarly affected the Hebrew Christians. The fact is confirmed by the very interesting sidelight on Palestinian Christianity given by Lucian in *De Morte Peregrini* xi.

28. We have no record of visits paid to Jerusalem for the Passover by the Twelve, but they may be assumed with safety from the fact that the Jewish Christians continue to observe the Law.

29. The plural "brethren of the Lord" in 1 Cor. ix. 5 implies that at least one of them besides S. James held a prominent position in the Church. This is confirmed by Jude 1 and the story of S. Jude's grandsons related by Hegesippus (*H.E.* iii. 20). (Obviously the evidence of the Epistle of S. Jude as to the prominence of its alleged author in the Church is not affected by doubts as to its authenticity.)

Apart from the "brethren of the Lord" we have no direct evidence of the existence of other Galilean followers of Our Lord outside the Twelve, who assumed an important position in the life of the Church. But for the reasons given in n. 18 they would naturally tend to return to Galilee, when the Church was established there, and so would not play any very prominent part in the events recorded by S. Luke. It is however only natural to suppose that besides the Galilean women referred to in Mk xv. 40 there were male disciples who are included in the company referred to in Lk. xxiv. 33 and Acts i. 15; and in view of their qualification on the score of personal acquaintance with Our Lord it may be presumed that they played an important part in the life of the Church in Galilee.

30. The probable number of such disciples of Judaean origin depends largely on the historicity of the ministry of Our Lord in Jerusalem as recorded in the Fourth Gospel. But apart from this we have evidence for a certain number of disciples, who had known Our Lord in the flesh although not Galileans, such as Joseph of Arimathea, and the friends of Our Lord at Bethany. It is probable that Joseph Barsabbas and Judas, apparently his brother (Acts i. 23 and xv. 22), were Judaean by origin, since the latter on the occasion of his mission to Antioch appears to represent the Hebrew section of the Church in Jerusalem, and Silas the Hellenist.

But it is obvious that this is only a somewhat precarious inference. The general question of the historicity of the ministry of Our Lord in Jerusalem, as recorded in S. John, falls outside the scope of this book.

31. Cf. c. I. n. 37.

32. I Thess. ii. 14 and 2 Cor. xi. 23 imply Jewish Christians who had suffered for their faith and were naturally respected for it. They cannot be Hellenist in sympathy in view of their opposition to S. Paul in the latter passage, but had presumably suffered in the persecution after the death of Stephen or in subsequent local persecutions. Such sufferings would inevitably tend to be regarded as a claim to consideration.

33. Cf. c. I. n. 46.

34. Mk iii. 21 (it is interesting to note that the detail is omitted by the other Synopusts) and 31 *seqq.* Cf. Jno. vii. 3–5. For the appearance of Our Lord to him after the Resurrection cf. I Cor. xv. 7. The appearance is not mentioned by the Synoptic Gospels: but it is established by the oldest record that we possess of the belief of the Church as to the facts of the Resurrection.

35. Whatever our judgment as to the truth of the narrative of the early chapters of S. Luke's Gospel may be (a question which obviously falls outside the scope of this book), there can be no doubt that S. Luke has succeeded in reproducing in them in a very remarkable degree the atmosphere of the earlier form of Pharisaical piety, with its earnest concentration on the attainment of personal holiness and its exalted spiritual view of the Messianic kingdom. At the same time the atmosphere, although Pharisaical and inspired by the ideas of a branch of Jewish literature with which S. Paul must have been well acquainted, bears no resemblance to anything in Pauline literature. To realize this it is only necessary to examine the following passages.

Lk. i. 6. *πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασιν τοῦ κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι.* (The phrase is practically a description of the Pharisee ideal.)	*Pss. Sol.* xiv. 1b. *τοῖς πορευομένοις ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ προσταγμάτων αὐτοῦ* (*i.e.* *τοῦ κυρίου*).
i. 15. *ἔσται μέγας ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται.*	*ib.* xvii. 42. *ὁ θεὸς κατηργάσατο αὐτὸν δυνατὸν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.*
i. 32. *δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυείδ...καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ.*	*ib.* xvii. 23. *ἀνάστησον αὐτοῖς τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν, υἱὸν Δαυείδ...τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ παιδά σου.*
i. 47. *ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου.*	*ib.* xvii. 1. *ἐν σοί, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, καυχήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν.*
i. 50. *τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ...τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν.*	*ib.* xiii. 11. *ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.* (Cf. ii. 37.)
i. 51, 52. *διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν.* (Cf. also ii. 35. *ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί.*)	*ib.* xvii. 26, 27. *ἔκτριψαι ὑπερηφανίαν ἁμαρτωλοῦ...καὶ ἔλεγξαι ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἐν λόγῳ καρδίας αὐτῶν.*
i. 54. *ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ μνησθῆναι ἐλέους.*	*ib.* vii. 9. *κατευθυνεῖς ἡμᾶς ἐν καιρῷ ἀντιλήψεως σου τοῦ ἐλεῆσαι τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ.*
i. 55. *τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*	*ib.* xvii. 5. *ὤμοσας αὐτῷ περὶ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*
i. 75. *ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ.*	*ib.* xvii. 45b *seqq.* *ποιμαίνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ...ἐν ὁσιότητι πάντας αὐτοὺς ἄξει* (where however there is a *v.l.* *ἰσότητι*).
i. 79. *τοῦ κατευθῦναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης*	*ib.* xviii. 9. *κατευθῦναι ἄνδρας ἐν ἔργοις δικαιοσύνης.*

Although the verbal resemblances are not so numerous in the songs of Zacharias and Symeon as they are in the earlier part of the opening of this Gospel, there is a general similarity of tone, which it is impossible not to recognize, between them and the *Psalms of Solomon*. That S. Paul should make little use of this work is natural; for it regards righteousness as consisting simply in the literal observance

of the Law as a means of attaining to holiness. The most obvious resemblance between a Pauline utterance and these Psalms is that noted in c. II. n. 48. But here we are dealing with S. Paul before his conversion, and with an utterance coming to him in his vision, which might be made up of material which, so far as his conscious mind was concerned, had almost completely lapsed from memory. The rabbinical Pharisaism of Jerusalem had apparently by S. Paul's time travelled far from the simplicity and devotion which inspired the *Psalms of Solomon*, and which, if S. Luke's picture is correct, still survived among devout Jews and Galileans at the time of the Incarnation.

It might therefore seem natural to suppose that this picture in Lk. i–ii was derived either from S. James the Lord's brother, whom S. Luke met at Jerusalem, or from some other member of the circle in which Our Lord passed His early life. The supposition is confirmed by the Epistle of S. James. The difficult metaphor of Jas iii. 6 becomes possible when compared to *Pss. Sol.* xii. 2, 3.

Jas iii. 6. ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας...ἡ σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τρόχον τῆς γενέσεως.

Pss. Sol. xii. 2, 3. ἐν ποικιλίᾳ στροφῆς οἱ λόγοι τῆς γλώσσης ἀνδρὸς πονηροῦ· ὥσπερ ἐν λαῷ πῦρ ἄναπτον καλλονὴν αὐτοῦ ἡ παροικία αὐτοῦ,...ἔκκοψαι δένδρα εὐφροσύνης φλογιζούσης παρανόμους.

Although the passage in the *Psalms* is corrupt, it seems clear that it contains the curious conception of the tongue of the wicked man as a devouring fire, which sets fire to its surroundings (the last clause is unintelligible, but should imply the setting on fire, *i.e.* the destruction not of the παράνομοι but of their neighbours). Cf. also:

Jas v. 11. τὴν ὑπομονὴν Ἰὼβ ἠκούσατε καὶ τὸ τέλος κυρίου εἴδετε ὅτι πολύσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ κύριος καὶ οἰκτίρμων.

Pss. Sol. ii. 40. ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτὸν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

Moreover, we find a strain of thought common to the writer of the *Psalms of Solomon*, S. Luke, and S. James in the contrast of ὕψος and ταπείνωσις which occurs in Lk. i. 52, Jas i. 9 and iv. 10, and runs through such passages as the description of the death of Pompey in *Pss. Sol.* ii. 30 *seqq.* (see *vv.* 35 and 39), cf. Ecclus. iii. 18, xi. 1, 13, etc.

A further source which has furnished ideas both to S. Luke and S. James is the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. (This work was of course familiar to S. Paul.) (Cf. c. IV. § i. n. 9.) We may note in the first place the fulfilment in the Baptist and Our Lord of the expectations of a Messiah from the tribes of Levi and Judah. Cf. also:

Lk. i. 17. ἐπίστρεψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων.

Test. Dan. v. 11. ἐπιστρέψει καρδίας ἀπειθεῖς πρὸς κύριον.

ii. 19. Μαρία πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα συνβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς.

Test. Lev. vi. 2. συνετήρουν τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου.

ii. 32. φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν.

Test. Lev. xiv. 4. φῶς τὸ δοθὲν εἰς φωτισμὸν παντὸς ἀνθρώπου.

ii. 52. χάριτι παρὰ Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

Test. Reub. iv. 8. χάριν ἐνώπιον Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων.

And for parallels to S. James note the passage iii. 8[b] *seqq.*

(ἡ γλῶσσα) ἀκατάστατον κακὸν μεστὴ ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου...ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα...μήτι ἡ πηγὴ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ὀπῆς βρύει τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρόν;

Test. Gad v. 1. (τὸ μῖσος) τὰ μικρὰ μεγάλα ποιεῖ, τὸ φῶς σκότος παρέχει (cf. ἀκατάστατον κακόν in S. James), καὶ τὸ γλυκὺ πικρὸν λέγει...κακῶν καὶ ἰοῦ διαβολικοῦ τὴν καρδίαν ἐκπληροῖ.

Test. Benj. vi. 5. ἡ ἀγαθὴ διάνοια οὐκ ἔχει δύο γλώσσας εὐλογίας καὶ κατάρας.

Cf. also iii. 13 *seqq.* with its conjunction of the evils of hatred and lying, and the confusion which they produce in the soul, with *Test. Dan.* iv. 7 *seqq.* There is perhaps a verbal reminiscence in *v.* 18, καρπὸς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην, of *Test. Dan.* v. 2, ἀλλ' ἔσεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἔχοντες τὸν Θεὸν τῆς εἰρήνης. There is a distinct similarity also between S. James' "psychology of sin" (i. 15) and

Test. Reub. v. 6; while Jas iv. 7, *ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν* may be a reminiscence of *Test. Napht.* viii. 4, *καὶ ὁ διάβολος φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν*.

It is perhaps worth noting the very close resemblance between Ecclus. xlviii. 10 and Lk. i. 17 in view of the frequent use made of Ecclus. in S. James (cf. introduction to the book in *Apocr. and Pseud.* I. 295; but the resemblance may be only due to a common use of Mal. iv. 6).

A further document which bears evidence to the common atmosphere of the Epistle of S. James and the earlier chapters of S. Luke is *Pirke Aboth*. The saying of Hillel in i. 12, expressing the duty of Israel to bring men nigh unto the Law, finds a parallel in Lk. ii. 32; while for S. James cf. the sayings of Simeon son of Hillel in *P.A.* i. 17 with Jas i. 19, 22, iii. 5. Cf. also c. 1. n. 46. A further connection between S. Luke and the early Pharisaism may be seen in his use of the phrase "The Consolation" for the coming of the Messiah in ii. 25, for which cf. *Tr. San. T.* vi. 6. We may also observe that in the speech of S. James recorded in Acts xv. 14 the phrase *ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ* is characteristic of the school of thought. Cf. *Pss. Sol.* ix. 8, xi. 2, 7, xv. 14, *Test. Lev.* iv. 4, *Judah* xxiii. 5, Lk. i. 68.

It may be noted that in the incidents of Mk iii. 20 *seqq.* the attempt of the relatives of Our Lord to restrain Him from preaching is apparently connected with the visits of the Scribes from Jerusalem ascribing His powers to Beelzebub. It would seem that His revolt against the traditional view of Jewish piety had alarmed His family no less than the Pharisees of Jerusalem, and that the two parties were acting in conjunction. This would be natural if His "brethren" had always followed the Pharisaic tradition.

It will be clear from the foregoing that the Lucan narrative of Our Lord's infancy and the Epistle of S. James emanate from the same circle of Jewish ideas. This is only natural if S. James had been brought up in the primitive Pharisaic piety with which the Lucan narrative is filled, and explains his early refusal to accept Our Lord's claims and also his subsequent career as a Christian Pharisee.

36. The narrative of Hegesippus preserved in *H.E.* ii. 23, as to the ascetic habits of S. James, is of course worthless as it stands in view of the obvious mythical elements which it contains. The narrative of *Antt.* xx. ix. 1 is however reliable. Doubts have been cast on it owing to the fact that Origen (*c. Cels.* i. 47) quotes as from Josephus a different account of the end of S. James, which is represented as the immediate cause of the siege of Jerusalem. (For a discussion of the version known to Origen and its influence on other writers who follow him see *G.J.V.* I. 581.) On the other hand there is every reason to suppose that the version known to Origen was a Christian interpolation, since it has the obvious motive of connecting the fall of Jerusalem with the murder of S. James. This does not apply to the narrative of *Antt.* It must be admitted that the present description of S. James as *τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λεγομένου, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ* is open to suspicion. But the context makes it necessary to suppose that the rest of the narrative is genuine, and that it contained in its original form a reference to S. James, which led a Christian interpolator to paraphrase it with the present description. Josephus narrates how S. James (in the present text) and some others were stoned at the order of the younger Annas after the death of Festus and before the arrival of Albinus. He goes on to state that *ὅσοι ἐδόκουν ἐπιεικέστατοι τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἶναι καὶ τὰ περὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς* were angry at this and complained to Agrippa II and Albinus, on the ground that Annas had no right to inflict the death-penalty. Now there can be no doubt that the persons making the complaint are the Pharisees. (For the description of the Pharisees by such phrases cf. *Antt.* xvii. ii. 4, xix. vii. 4, *B.J.* ii. viii. 14.) But it is incredible that a Christian interpolator, finding in Josephus a story of the murder of a Pharisee by Annas, and the consequent protests of the Pharisees, should have considered that the incident could suitably be altered, by a change of the victim's name, into an account of the murder of S. James. Still less is it conceivable that he would have invented the whole episode, and represented the Pharisees as protesting against the murder. The Pharisees in a Christian interpolation would have appeared, as they do in Hegesippus, as instigating it. Hence it seems safe to conclude that, with the possible exception of the description quoted above, the narrative of Josephus is a genuine record of the martyrdom of S. James. This conclusion is supported by the

fact that in Hegesippus he is referred to as ὁ δίκαιος, *i.e.* the devout in the observance of the Law. Here Hegesippus is using the word as part of the regular title by which he was known, and this detail is probably accurate. In any case the fabulous piety attributed to him, which is of a strictly Jewish type, is far more likely to be an exaggeration of a genuine tradition than a Christian invention pure and simple. A Christian imagination with no material to work on would hardly produce such a purely Jewish picture. It thus becomes possible to understand why S. James was able to remain in safety in Jerusalem at the time of the persecution of Herod Agrippa I, and why the Pharisees protested against his murder by the younger Annas. They had no general motive for protesting against the infliction of the death-penalty by the High Priest. It was not contrary to Jewish Law, and they had no particular motive for upholding Roman Law in such a case. On the other hand, if S. James was a Pharisee, they would be able to protect him against Herod, at a time when the Twelve had to flee from Jerusalem, and they would be certain to protest against the murder of a fellow-Pharisee by the High Priest. Further the attitude of S. James becomes consistent throughout the N.T. He does not support the demand for the circumcision of the Gentiles, because by itself one isolated piece of legal observance is worthless (cf. c. I. n. 46, and below, c. VI. § ii. n. 35). None the less he is the inevitable successor of the Twelve, since the Hebrew Christians would naturally regard as their leader the most eminent of the Pharisee converts. For the view that his position at Jerusalem was directly due to his connection with Our Lord there is no evidence; while the absence of any allusion to the connection in the opening verses of the Epistles of S. James and S. Jude tells strongly against such a theory, whether the Epistles be genuine or spurious.

37. The austerities related of S. James by Hegesippus are obviously unreliable, though not necessarily impossible. Abstinence from wine and meat would be a natural expression of Jewish asceticism; cf. 2 Macc. v. 27, Lk. i. 15 (from which Hegesippus has borrowed), Mk i. 6, *T. Reub.* i. 10, 4 Esdr. ix. 24, *B.J.* II. viii. 2 *seqq.*, *Vita* 2, and the accounts of the Essenes given by Philo (see c. I. n. 28). In general the type of piety advocated in the Epistle of S. James is of a strongly ascetic type in the strict sense of the word; its whole emphasis is laid not on the duty of attaining to a standard of Christian virtue but on the struggle to attain to perfection. This is clear from the vigour with which the writer condemns as serious sins those faults which the ordinary view of Christian morality regards as minor imperfections (cf. c. I. n. 44). Yet the writer is conscious that πολλὰ πταίομεν ἅπαντες, the test of human perfection being to abstain in external matters from sins of speech. Similarly he takes the ascetic view that sin is to be imputed to the man who knows what it is right to do, and yet fails to do it, *i.e.* that sin is to be found not merely in positively sinful actions, but in the failure to perform positively good ones (iv. 17). We may also note that suffering persecution or poverty is to be accounted as a privilege (i. 2, 9, ii. 1 *seqq.*).

Naturally in writing to Christians who did not observe the Law, or only observed it in the sense of the popular Judaism of the Dispersion, S. James is unable to insist on the observance of the Pharisaical system. None the less it is instructive to observe the extent to which he reverts to type in his emphasis on the literal observance of certain precepts (iv. 13, v. 12). Again Christianity is regarded very much in the same light as the Law was regarded by the great Pharisaical teachers, being in fact a higher and perfected form of the old Law (i. 25, ii. 28, cf. *P.A.* v. 25 and vi *passim*).

38. Cf. c. I. n. 7.

39. This is to be presumed from the fact that the Church of Jerusalem as a whole was not composed of Pharisees, and that S. James is willing to accept the Gentile converts without making any demand that they should accept his own standards. See below, c. VI. § ii. nn. 35 *seqq.*

40. The position of S. James at Jerusalem is well-established in Gal. i. 19, where he already ranks as an Apostle. For his formal recognition as ruler of the Church in Jerusalem see c. V. § ii. n. 21.

41. For the probable disadvantages of a Galilean Jew as a leader in Jerusalem cf. above, n. 18. In any case the eminence of S. James as a Pharisee would over-ride it, while his connection with Our Lord would exempt him from being classed with the general run of Galileans.

42. See above, n. 36, and below, c. IV. § i. n. 61.

CHAPTER IV

THE ENTRANCE OF THE GENTILES

§ i. SAUL THE CONVERT

THE period occupied by the events described in the preceding chapter extended over some eighteen months. In the interval Saul had, after his recovery from the shock of his conversion, retired for a brief period to the Arabian desert. Here he adjusted his old beliefs to the new light vouchsafed to him on the Damascus road[1]. The result of his conversion was to set at the disposal of the Church a force differing entirely in character from anything it had previously possessed. Hitherto the direction of the new movement had lain with unlearned and ignorant men, or at best with men whose only learning lay within the limits of the traditional Judaism of Palestine. For a brief period indeed Stephen had endeavoured to put forward an interpretation of the new revelation which might make it universal and not merely local in its scope; but he had never held a recognized position as a teacher of the new sect, and his activities had been too shortlived to modify the general outlook of Palestinian Christianity. Nor had his somewhat irresponsible interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures been of such a kind as to provide a solid basis for the development of the new creed. In Saul the Church had found a champion who could combine the orthodox learning of Judaism with the wisdom of the Gentile as it was understood by the Hellenist.

In his origin indeed Saul was scarcely a Hellenist[2]; for although he was a native of Tarsus and a Roman citizen by birth, his parents had in his infancy migrated from Tarsus to Jerusalem[3]. Here he had enjoyed the best education that Judaism could give. At the feet of Gamaliel he had been brought up in the comparatively enlightened Pharisaism of the school of Hillel[4]. He had indeed learnt to consider the strict observance of the Law as the only possible means of avoiding the iniquities of the Gentile world, and to safeguard himself from all danger of infringing the least commandment by regulating in accordance with scribal tradition the minutest details of his daily life. Yet this regulation was recognized as being not an end in itself but a means for attaining that exalted standard of perfection which was necessary for the servant of the one true God[5]. Further he had learnt to long for the day foretold by the prophets when the Gentiles were to be turned away from their idols and brought to the knowledge of the one true God, serving Him in accordance with the Law which He had revealed in the place which He had chosen[6]. He thus retained

the higher ideals of the earlier Pharisees in whom contact with the Gentiles had led to the hope of their conversion to Judaism and their salvation by the Law; he had not yielded as had the Pharisees of the rival school to the temptation to repay with hatred the outrages inflicted on the national faith by Gentile hostility and the stupidity of Roman officialism[7]. At the same time he had never questioned the paramount importance of the Law both for the Jew and for the Gentile. Impossible as it might be to attain even by the strictest observance to that ideal of righteousness which the Jewish faith demanded, yet it was only through such an obedience that man could hope to overcome the constant tendency to sin, which he had inevitably inherited from the sin of his first parents, and attain to a righteousness which God could accept as sufficient for his salvation. Salvation, regarded as admission after the resurrection of the body to a state of everlasting glory, was indeed only to be obtained by those predestined to it by a divine election, yet it was obtained by a voluntary observance of the Law on the part of the free will of man. Neither before nor after his conversion did Saul succeed in reconciling this inherent contradiction of Pharisaic thought[8].

Inevitably he was familiar not only with the literature and traditions which the Pharisees had constructed about the letter of the Old Testament, but also with the works of the apocalyptic literature which played a large part in contemporary Jewish thought[9]. These writings, circulated under the names of the worthies of the Old Testament, were the expression of the national yearning for the day when God would vindicate His people before all the world, rewarding them for their stedfastness and punishing their oppressors. It was this literature in particular which kept alive the spiritual ideals of the older Pharisaism, difficult as it was to combine them with the growth of the tendency to insist on the importance of the *minutiae* of legal observance, and to extend the dominion of the details of the Law over the daily life of the devout Jew—a tendency which was steadily prevailing at the time[10]. Difficult however as the task might be, there could be no doubt that the Law was the one true revelation of God. The possession of it marked out Israel from the rest of the world, as the Chosen People. By observing it the nation could hope to shorten the days of oppression and bring about the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, and the individual to make good his share in the eternal happiness which was to be the reward of God's Chosen People after their life on earth[11].

In other points also Saul accepted the current theology developed by the Pharisees on the basis of the canonical Scriptures. He inherited

the belief that the universe was the scene of the constant activity of countless spiritual beings, some good and some evil, the angels of God and the spirits who were condemned to eternal punishment for their rebellion against Him. The activities of these spiritual agents were to be discerned in numerous directions. The movements of the heavenly bodies, the histories of the nations of the world, and the spiritual life of the individual soul were committed to their charge or subject to their influence[12]. Certain classes of spirits were good, while others were definitely evil: the latter were sometimes identified with the gods of the heathen, or regarded as having instigated them to idolatry, a view somewhat inconsistent with the more conventional tendency to deride those gods as being merely the work of men's hands[13]. Similarly he was familiar with the numerous legends which rabbinical ingenuity had added to the narratives of the Old Testament, either to enforce their interpretation of its doctrinal import or to satisfy the curiosity of their hearers as to points on which it was silent[14]. In these respects, as in his zeal for the traditions by which the great teachers of the age had expanded and interpreted the letter of the written Law, Saul was a typical Pharisee of his time.

His education was however by no means confined to the Scriptures of the Jews and the written or traditional lore which had grown up around them in Palestine. He had, in common with many Jews, who had less connection with the Dispersion than he possessed himself, been profoundly influenced by the attempt to reconcile the history and religion of Israel with the learning and culture of Hellenism. The influence of Greek thought was naturally strongest among the Jewish colonies in foreign regions; but through them and also through the immediate contact between Jew and Gentile in Palestine itself, it had, in spite of all opposition, profoundly affected the outlook of Judaism in Jerusalem. In this attempt to reconcile the crudity of primitive Hebrew legend and the elaborate edifice of legal detail constructed since the return from the exile with the philosophic and religious conceptions of the age a whole system of allegorical interpretation had grown up, in which the seeming absurdity or impossibility of the letter was made the vehicle of a deep spiritual truth. The attempt had a history of at least two centuries behind it. In the first instance the outstanding peculiarities of the Law as it affected the daily life of the Jew had been shown to be the symbolical means for inculcating on the people an exalted conception of personal morality More ambitious writers endeavoured to interpret the whole history and religion of Israel as the self-revelation, in incidents intended to

serve as types, of the one true God, Whose existence was postulated by philosophy. The intention of the authors of such works was to justify the national faith either to the Gentile or to the Jew whose faith was endangered by his life among the Gentiles; but it was bound to react on Judaism itself both by refining the crudity of the Old Testament narrative, and the later Jewish beliefs which had been derived from it, and also by diverting attention from the letter to the spiritual truths which it was intended to reveal. Finally the whole cosmogony of the Pentateuch had been shown to be nothing less than an allegorical exposition of the metaphysical systems of Gentile thought. Such a task might well have seemed impossible but for the ingenuity with which Jewish casuistry had already accustomed itself to find Scriptural authority for its developments of the Law. For this purpose isolated texts, chosen without the smallest reference to their context and interpreted in the most arbitrary manner, could be made the basis of some point of doctrine entirely remote from the intention of the original writer. By the use of the same method the Old Testament could be made to serve as the basis of a philosophical system which would accommodate Jewish monotheism to Gentile metaphysics; the method remained that of the Jewish rabbi, although its objective was entirely different[15].

With the conventional outlines of this system Saul was familiar, but while he accepted those outlines as part of his general system of thought he had no great acquaintance with the literature of Greece, and was content to assimilate the general religious conceptions of the age without making any very deep attempt at an independent examination of the great teachers of the Gentiles. He had some acquaintance with Greek literature, but such knowledge was rather that of one who had read portions of it as part of his education in the Greek language than that of an independent scholar[16]. None the less it was sufficient to enable him to realize the impossibility of condemning the whole Gentile world to summary perdition. The partial success which it had attained in its search for God rendered all the more appalling the wholesale depravity which was characteristic of it in general. Since the only means for rescuing mankind from its present condition was the Law, Saul's knowledge could only spur him on to a greater zeal for its observance in the minutest details. By such a zeal the Jew throughout the world could hope to fulfil his divine commission of revealing the truth to the Gentiles about him. But he could not for a moment question the necessity of the closest literal observance of the Law, or tolerate any attempt to reduce it to

a mere system of symbolical teaching the letter of which might safely be disregarded[17].

The death of Stephen and the fortitude of the Christians under persecution had however shaken his belief in the traditional view of religion. He saw in them a successful realization of the holiness which it was the task of the Law to produce, and which, as he was only too well aware, it had failed to produce in himself. His growing doubts had culminated in the vision of the Damascus road[18], and from that moment he saw that the old attitude was impossible.

Jesus was in fact the Messiah, not an impostor, nor yet a dangerous innovator, who, whatever His personal virtues might have been, had none the less been guilty of an impious attempt to overthrow the whole basis on which the Jewish religion rested. The effect of this change of view on Saul was revolutionary. He did not indeed follow Stephen in throwing over as a complete error the whole of the past development of the Jewish race. His wider learning and more balanced judgment, and also his inability to part entirely with the whole system on which his past life had been built, led him rather to see in the Jewish Scriptures a vast system of allegory or typology enacted on the scene of history. The purpose of the whole was to foreshadow the final revelation of God to man in the person of Jesus, in Whom all that had gone before was fulfilled and rendered obsolete[19]. Jesus Himself was the divine pattern or prototype after which man had been created, and through Whom the existing world was made. His appearance on the stage of history was the fulfilment of the Messianic promises made to Israel, interpreted as a spiritual deliverance from the bondage of sin, not of course as a material deliverance from Gentile oppression[20]. He was thus to be identified with the pre-existing Messianic king whose appearance devout Judaism had hoped for[21]. His death by the Cross, a form of death to which in the eyes of the orthodox Jew a peculiar curse was attached[22], at once expiated and abolished the curse which Adam's sin had brought upon the world; for the obedience of One greater than Adam could alone suffice to make amends for that offence[23]. The curse had been extended under the Jewish dispensation to all who did not obey the Law, in fact to all mankind, for obedience to the Law was a feat which surpassed man's capacities[24]. Thus Jesus had abolished the curse; and belief in Him accompanied by baptism enabled the believer by a divine power freely bestowed upon him to attain to that righteousness which the Law had revealed while leaving mankind incapable of attaining to it[25]. The new life in the Spirit, Whose

presence was revealed in outward manifestations, was in fact the accomplishment of the object of the Law, which had shown the sin of man without revealing the means of overcoming its universal domination.

The framework of Saul's theology was thus outwardly an adaptation of ideas familiar to Judaism. In fact however it was largely influenced by the speculations of Oriental religions, which had penetrated either directly or through the medium of Hellenistic philosophy into the Judaism of the Dispersion. In this circle of ideas the Greek conception of the Divine Reason as a power immanent in the whole order of the universe and the earlier belief of Plato in a divine idea of which the visible world is a counterpart had been fused, not merely with the Old Testament narrative of creation, the God of the Jewish nation and the hopes of a Messianic kingdom, but also with the Oriental belief that the soul of man was an immanent element of the divine nature, imprisoned in the material sphere against its own will. Salvation from the tyranny of the material world and the blind forces of destiny which ruled it was the sovereign need of man. This salvation was wrought by the appearance in human form of the divine prototype of humanity, of which the individual man was a copy or counterpart[26]. By descending himself into the bondage of the material sphere he enabled those who sought him aright to escape to the plane of spiritual existence which was the proper portion of mankind. This knowledge of the divine deliverer, and the means of entering into communion with him, might take the form either of a religious cult or of a system of philosophy. There were many systems, which in one form or another offered to men the deliverance for which they longed; often they were, like Hellenistic Judaism, an attempt to explain away the crudities of ancient mythologies, and so infuse a new life into a system of religion which by itself could not stand the test of the advance of human thought. But in one form or another these systems had already gained a wide popularity in the Gentile world.

Saul in his theology borrowed freely from this circle of ideas, whether directly or through the medium of Hellenistic Judaism. None the less his teaching was sharply separated from them by his insistence on the exclusive claim of Judaism as the true revelation of God to man, and still more by his identification of the divine redeemer with the historical person of Jesus and the proved fact of His Resurrection.

It followed inevitably from these presuppositions that the salvation which mankind needed was to be regarded not as deliverance

from the material world and the domination of fate, but from the burden of sin which prevented man from attaining to the righteousness for which he was created. The salvation for which he looked could not be fully realized within the limits of the present order of the world: it was to be looked for in a future order of existence, which naturally, in virtue of his Jewish training, he expected to be inaugurated by the triumphant return of Jesus to establish the Messianic kingdom upon earth. That kingdom had already been inaugurated by the appearance of Jesus in the world, which was the consummation of the old order and the beginning of the new; the new was to be consummated by the return of Jesus in glory to judge all men according to their works.

In the brief interval that was left between this inauguration of the Messianic era and its final consummation by the return of Jesus in glory the Gospel must be preached to all the world[27]. The Jew had the prior claim to hear it[28]; and for the Jewish Christian it was necessary to continue that observance of the Law without which it would be hopeless to expect that the rest of the nation would accept the Gospel[29]. But the Law had never been promulgated to the Gentiles, and it would be ridiculous to endeavour to enforce its acceptance now, when its old validity had ceased[30]. The Gospel alone provided the power of overcoming that domination of sin, which had oppressed both Jew and Gentile alike. Neither had found the means of overcoming it in the past; but it had now been bestowed upon man by a divine gift of grace, which he had done nothing to deserve[31]. For in the enthusiasm of his conversion Saul felt himself actually delivered from the old burden of sin, that is, from the constant and laborious struggle to attain by the observance of the Law to a state of complete righteousness. His conversion had produced such a revolution in his whole conception of life that he found in himself a completely new power over sin[32]. That power might be regarded as the Holy Spirit given to and dwelling in himself or as the risen life of Christ established in him as the result of a death to his old life or as the divine love imparted to him by the Holy Ghost[33]; in any case the phrase described the spiritual conviction of the possession of an entirely new power to achieve righteousness, and a deliverance from that constant tendency to yield to temptations entirely contrary to the general object of his life, which had been his experience hitherto. It was this new power, as experienced in himself, that was to replace the Law, both in the Jew and in the Gentile; and it was obviously idle to retain, when preaching to the Gentiles, that old burden of

external observances, which had so often proved fatal to the acceptance of the Jewish faith.

Such was the "Gospel" with which Saul returned from his sojourn in Arabia. He had certain peculiar qualifications for bearing it to the Gentile world. His Roman citizenship secured for him within the Roman Empire a legal status which enabled him to some extent to avoid the persecutions[34] which were bound to await him, while his Hellenistic training rendered him familiar with the traditional arguments by which the Jews of the Dispersion were accustomed to prove the superiority of Jewish monotheism to the official worships of the Roman Empire and the less recognized, but more popular, cults of the age[35]. With these arguments he could hope to gain a hearing in the wide circles which were continually seeking for a more adequate religion than any which the times afforded, and were inclined to look to Judaism to supply their need. Saul might well hope that his new version of Judaism, supported as it was by the historical fact of the Resurrection of Jesus and the visible manifestations of divine authority which the gift of the Spirit supplied, would win a still more sympathetic hearing than the old and incomplete Judaism, with its system of laborious and repulsive observances. The synagogues of the Dispersion were filled with devout Gentiles on the brink of accepting Judaism even in its old and inadequate version; who could doubt that they would greet with enthusiasm the new revelation which was its fulfilment[36]?

For the rest Saul in spite of his Hellenistic training was and remained a Jew, filled with all the fiery fanaticism of his nation for the true religion[37]. His zeal for propagating the truth was strong enough to make him indifferent to labours and sufferings, accompanied by voluntary ascetic practices, under which his somewhat delicate health might have been expected to succumb[38]. At the same time the violence of his enthusiasm left him subject to correspondingly violent fits of depression in the face of ill-success or anxiety[39]. The same extreme fluctuations of temperament marked his personal relations, in which he was capable equally of the most intense affection and outbursts of extravagant indignation[40]. His training as a Pharisee had not been calculated to render him tolerant of opposition from those whom he knew to be his inferiors in knowledge or in their standing as Christians, or willing to accept any compromise which tended to eviscerate the divine revelation which he believed to have been committed to his charge. He was perfectly capable of diplomacy as a means of attaining his ends; but it was a diplomacy which

13,620

ultimately refused to make any surrenders[41]. A temper less fanatical in its certainty and less autocratic in its methods[42] could have had but little hope of achieving the task that lay before him.

At Damascus he proceeded to lay before the Jews of the local synagogues his version of the faith which he had come to the city to extirpate. The atmosphere was unfavourable to his message. The Jewish faith had made considerable progress among the natives of the city, particularly among the women, but those who had not accepted it regarded it with dislike and suspicion[43]. His claim that Jesus was the Christ, and the inference that the effect of His coming was the abolition of the Law, was hardly likely to meet with acceptance in a city where on the one hand the old faith was making considerable progress, while on the other hand the Gentiles who rejected it were enemies of the Chosen People. Further the political situation was unfavourable. Damascus was still in the hands of Aretas, and this ruler was anxious to keep on good terms with his Jewish subjects, and in view of his tendency to pursue a patriotic and anti-Roman policy was hardly likely to care much for the fact that Saul was a Roman citizen[44]. The result was a plot on the part of the Jews against Saul's life, in which they were openly abetted by the local governor appointed by Aretas. Since his good offices enabled the Jews to watch the gates of the city in case Saul should attempt to escape, he was reduced to a somewhat undignified means of avoiding his enemies. His converts let him down from the wall in a basket, and he was thus able to save his life; but the attempt to preach the new Gospel in Damascus was scarcely a success[45].

From Damascus Saul returned to Jerusalem. Naturally the Church was inclined to regard with suspicion the leader of the persecution of two years before, and it was only through the good offices of Barnabas that he was able to convince Peter of the genuineness of his conversion. The rest of the Apostles were absent, except for James the Lord's brother[46]. On the other hand so soon as the truth of his conversion and the vision which led to it were accepted, there could be no doubt of his claim to take a leading place in the Christian community. The divine favour shown to him marked him out as reserved for some special task. Further his learning in the Law and the natural abilities, which had made him the leader of the younger generation of the Pharisees, would make him stand out still more prominently among the Christians, who had few leaders with any claim to learning or ability[47]. Finally his personal zeal in the rigid observance of the Law was a high recommendation in the eyes of the Church of Jerusalem[48].

Saul himself had no doubt of the nature of his position in the Church. His special call had made him, in spite of his unworthiness, an Apostle equal to any of the Twelve or those other converts who ranked in Jerusalem as more or less their equals[49]. For a fortnight he resided with Peter, at the end of which time the latter left the city[50]. Saul himself remained, and his position was in the eyes of the Christian world scarcely inferior to that of James the Lord's brother; and James himself already held a position in Jerusalem practically equal to that of the various members of the Twelve among the Churches of Judaea and Galilee. At this point a new prospect opened itself to him. The work of James and his fellow-Christians, who were mostly Hebrew in origin, left the Hellenists of the city almost unaffected[51]. Saul seemed intended to take up the work that Stephen had begun. As the leader of the recent persecution he was the most effective witness to the truths for which the martyr had laid down his life[52]. Further his doctrines were decidedly less provocative than those of Stephen. Saul regarded the Law and the system of Jewish worship not as a radically false development, but as the highest expression of the truth available for mankind prior to their fulfilment in the person of Jesus[53]. Nor did he deny that the Jewish nation itself was still bound to the observance of the Law; indeed he himself kept it with all the rigour of a Pharisee[54]. His statement of the Christian revelation might, he hoped, find acceptance among the Hellenists, who had rejected Stephen. Through them the Gospel would find its way to the Jewish communities of the Dispersion and so to the Gentile world at large[55].

Unfortunately his teaching proved no more acceptable to the circles to which it was addressed than that of Stephen. Although it did not deny the divine authority of the Jewish revelation, it none the less implied the abandonment of the exclusive claim of the Jews to regard themselves as the Chosen People of God. If the Gentiles could enter the Church on the same conditions as Jews, it followed that the Jew and the Gentile were in fact equal in His sight; and the Hellenists of Jerusalem as a whole were not for a moment prepared to abandon their national prerogatives[56]. A more solid objection was to be found in the fact that the Law was the only means by which the Jews and their proselytes were preserved from the iniquities of the heathen around them, and that the abolition of the Law left no safeguard for the preservation of that divinely-sanctioned code of ethics which it enjoined[57].

The older leaders of the Church indeed made no objection to

Saul's teaching. Peter hesitated to oppose the views of one so far his superior both in learning and in observance of the Law[58]; while James had too little respect for the lax obedience which was common among the general Jewish public to be enthusiastic for its imposition on Gentile converts. Manifestly they could not be expected to live up to the standard of the Pharisees in such a matter, since only a minority of the Jewish Christians did so; but a lower standard was worthless and therefore could not be demanded[59].

Among the Hellenists, however, Saul was met with the most violent opposition. His past history and his eminence in the eyes of the Jewish public at large did not impress them as an adequate reason for betraying the faith of their fathers. He was merely a renegade to be destroyed like his predecessor. The task however was not easy. Maryllus the procurator[60] was hardly likely to sanction a religious persecution, even if it were demanded by the Sanhedrin. The Pharisaic party on that body would not sanction a demand for the execution of a Pharisee, especially of a Pharisee of the eminence of Saul[61]. Even if the sacerdotal party had been seriously interested in his version of the Gospel—and at the moment it seemed only an academic opinion and not a matter of serious politics—they could not hope to intervene against the wishes of the Pharisees. The Hellenists could only seek to suppress the obnoxious teaching by assassination.

This Saul was ready and even anxious to face. He was confident that his past history and the fact of his conversion would in the end persuade the Hellenists of the truth of his message, and that he would thus be able to make Jerusalem the centre for the conversion of the world. But his hopes were not to be fulfilled. A vision appeared to him in the Temple ordering his immediate departure[62]. His ministry as the Apostle of the Hellenists of Jerusalem ended after a brief period, and with the approval of the Church he left the city to carry his message to the Jews of the Dispersion[63].

The natural starting-point for his labours was his native city of Tarsus. As a citizen of the place and also of the Roman Empire he enjoyed a position which would guarantee him from illegal persecution[64]. There was at Tarsus a large Jewish population, and his preaching in their synagogues would also reach the ears of the Gentiles who attended the meetings of those bodies[65]. The city was also an intellectual centre of some importance and beliefs expounded there would be disseminated over a considerable area[66]. The Jews of the city might be less violently attached to the forms of the national

faith than those whose piety had proved strong enough to persuade them to return from the Dispersion to Jerusalem[67]. Consequently Tarsus was indicated as his next objective, especially as Antioch, a nearer and more important centre, had already to some extent been evangelized by others[68].

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV, SECTION I

1. For the view that S. Paul attempted a mission to Arabia and the reasons for rejecting it see c. II. n. 49. That his period of retirement into the desert was a brief one seems probable, though it can only be conjectured. S. Paul, however, in view of his rabbinical upbringing, would almost certainly follow the precedents of the O.T., which would naturally suggest a retirement of forty days for the purpose, after the precedents of Moses in Exod. xxiv. 18 and Elijah in 1 Kings xix. 8. This precedent, which no doubt influenced the fast of Our Lord in the desert, would influence S. Paul no less strongly; the fact that it is not directly mentioned in the Acts or by S. Paul is not surprising, since he might naturally be reticent on such a point. The reference to the visit to Arabia in Gal. i. 17 is only forced from him by the necessities of controversy. Naturally however the point cannot be regarded as more than a conjecture.

For the general chronology of this period of S. Paul's life cf. c. v. § i. n. 1.

2. S. Paul was also a citizen of Tarsus (Acts xxi. 39), from which it follows that his father had resided for some time in the city. Doubts as to his Roman citizenship have been raised in view of the three "beatings with rods" mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 25. On this point see below, c. v. § iii. n. 4. The reason for his claim to citizenship of Tarsus rather than of Rome in the passage in Acts is his desire to explain his knowledge of Greek and to dissociate himself from "the Egyptian." To do so he gives an account of his actual origin, instead of making a claim to Roman citizenship which would give no information on the matter. It is further to be noted that apparently it was customary in a trial before an Imperial officer to inquire the province from which the prisoner came. At any rate this seems to have been the rule in Palestine (Lk. xxiii. 6; Acts xxiii. 27, 34, where Felix, knowing S. Paul to be a Roman, asks, apparently as a regular formality, from what province he comes). Possibly the question of Felix is due to the necessity of verifying S. Paul's claim to Roman citizenship by inquiries in his birth-place; but it is also possible that in view of the somewhat complicated provincial arrangements in Syria and Asia Minor it was usual to ascertain whether the prisoner was in fact a subject of the Empire or of one of the dependent monarchies, whose rulers it would at least be politic to inform of the proceedings. In any case the inquiry as to the province of the prisoner in a trial in Palestine seems well-attested, and S. Paul, in claiming to be a citizen of Tarsus, is giving information to Lysias which the latter was certain to demand; his silence as to his Roman citizenship is due to the fact that at the moment the information was not needed.

3. Acts xxii. 3, 2 Cor. xi. 22, Phil. iii. 5. S. Paul's claim to be a Hebrew in the second of these three passages can hardly mean anything but that he claims to be a Hebrew as against a Hellenist. His claim is not strictly accurate, since he was born at Tarsus, but it is justifiable if practically the whole of his conscious life had been spent in Palestine. If he means to claim to be a Hebrew in the strict sense in the last passage, and in consequence to claim that his parents were Hebrews also, it would seem to be implied that his family had for some time before his birth resided partly in Tarsus, of which they were citizens, and partly in Palestine, of which they could claim to be natives. Cf. c. II. n. 3.

4. How far the school of Hillel was more liberal in its interpretation of the Law than the rival school of Shammai seems doubtful. See *Life and Times*, I. 238, II. 407, *G.J.V.* II. 426. One main important difference lay in the fact that the followers of Shammai tended to support the nationalist movement. The contemptuous

attitude of Gamaliel to the revolt of Judas of Galilee (Acts v. 37) is presumably due to the fact that the Pharisaic supporters of that movement (*Antt.* XVIII. i. 1) were followers of Shammai. For further evidence see *Life and Times*, *locc. citt.* Thus it seems that S. Paul would not be trained to regard the Gentiles with the violent hostility of those who could only look upon them as hated oppressors to be resisted by force. In such matters, however, as the teaching of S. Stephen, both schools would be united in their opposition. It is also probable that the school of Shammai would not have tolerated that familiarity with heathen literature which we find in Josephus and S. Paul (cf. for the former c. I. n. 53).

5. For a somewhat exaggerated and partial estimate of this devotion of the Pharisees to the attainment of righteousness, the observance of the Law being regarded simply as the necessary means to the end, cf. Herford, *Pharisaism*. The same aspect is emphasized in *Pirke Aboth*. No doubt the Pharisee would always have explained that his observance of the Law was due to the fact that it was the divinely appointed means for attaining to righteousness, and no doubt the conception of righteousness was often an exalted one. But this is by no means sufficient to disprove the charge made in the Gospels that in fact their main preoccupation lay in the detailed elaboration of the literal aspect of the Law to an extent which tended to obliterate the spiritual ideal which it was intended to inculcate.

6. Cf. c. I. n. 57. 7. Cf. c. I. n. 51 and n. 4 above.

8. For a general survey of S. Paul's relations to the outlook of the Pharisaic Judaism of his time cf. Thackeray, *The Relation of St Paul to contemporary Jewish Thought*. It must be borne in mind that the mere appearance of a striking resemblance between S. Paul and contemporary literature does not necessarily imply a direct borrowing on his part. The evidence, however, quite clearly shows that in many instances S. Paul's theology is simply a combination of Christianity with the general outlook of Pharisaism. This outlook itself is simply an attempt to harmonize the often primitive conceptions of religion found in the O.T., particularly in the Pentateuch, with the facts which confront any enlightened religious consciousness. This is noticeably the case in regard to the conception of original sin. There is of course no authority for such a belief in the early narrative of Genesis. On the other hand the fact that man by nature finds evil easier and more pleasant than good is one of the first problems which religion has to face so soon as it begins to concern itself seriously with ethics. The rabbinical view of an evil impulse latent in man before the fall but dominant in consequence of it (Thackeray, p. 35) appears quite clearly in Ro. vii. 14 *seqq*. Although here this dominance of sin in the natural man is not attributed to the fall, yet the attribution of death to the fall as a result of Adam's sin, which extends itself in some undefined way to all his descendants in v. 12 *seqq*., is entirely in harmony with rabbinical teaching on the subject and makes it safe to assume that S. Paul would have ascribed the dominance of sin in man to the same event. In both cases of course the conception arises from the natural tendency to find the origin of the invariable inclination of man to prefer evil to good in the curse of Genesis iii. 16.

The remedy for this tendency to sin was the observance of the Law. Thackeray, p. 81 *seqq*., quotes instances of the Jewish belief that the observance of the Law enabled man to escape the condemnation to which the transgressor was liable. His escape is due to the fact that he is actually righteous: his acceptance by God is merely the recognition of man's achievement. In this matter of course S. Paul breaks completely with his contemporaries, substituting faith in Christ for the works of the Law: in Pauline theology faith replaces works as the factor which makes man righteous (cf. below, n. 25). The great interest of S. Paul's position in this matter from a purely historical point of view lies in his assertion in Ro. vii that even before his conversion he had realized the impossibility of attaining to righteousness by means of the Law. This sense of the inadequacy of the Law meets us also in 4 Esdras (see the following note). Here however the sense of the inadequacy of the Law is very largely evoked by the disaster of the Jewish rebellion and the fall of Jerusalem: it is quite impossible to say how far, if at all, the writer would have felt it, if the affairs of the nation had prospered. Consequently we have no real evidence that this sense of the inadequacy of the Law as a means for obtaining righteousness was felt in contemporary Judaism apart from S. Paul. The

inadequacy of the Law was indeed bound to follow from the standard of righteousness put forward by Our Lord; but it is not legitimate to quote 4 Esdras as evidence for the general existence of such a sense among the Pharisees of S. Paul's day. It is of course possible that it was felt by others; if so it would appear that they followed S. Paul in embracing Christianity. It is clear that this point of view left no permanent trace on rabbinical Judaism. We may indeed suspect that the language of Ro. vii exaggerates S. Paul's dissatisfaction with the Law before his conversion; but the existence of a very strong dissatisfaction is clear from the fact that the inadequacy of the Law as a means of producing righteousness and the power of Christianity to do so are fundamental doctrines in his system of theology.

The doctrine of predestination as it meets us in S. Paul is the inevitable result of the same factors as those already noticed in the case of original sin. Any religion which has an adequate conception of God must hold that the whole course of events is ordered by Him, and that He is conscious of the fate of each individual soul. In popular language it is natural to say that God foresees the election of some and the rejection of others, although such language ignores the difficulty of supposing that God is subject to the category of time. On the other hand this view necessarily denies the moral responsibility of the individual, who can logically reply in the language of Ro. ix. 19. S. Paul never finds any adequate solution of this inherent difficulty of reconciling the omnipotence of God with the liberty of the individual soul. It is possible that no logical solution is discoverable which is entirely satisfactory. Cf. Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, pp. 90 *seqq.* S. Paul is content to assert the omnipotence of God, in language which logically denies the liberty of the individual, while insisting elsewhere on the liberty of the individual in language which is really fatal to the main line of his repudiation of the Law (cf. below, n. 31). The immediate point of interest is to note that the same difficulty was recognized by Pharisaic theology as described by Josephus in *B.J.* II. viii. 14, where its attitude is described as an ineffective attempt to solve the difficulty by recognizing the omnipotence of God yet allowing a limited degree of freedom to man. Here again S. Paul builds on his Pharisaic upbringing, without finding any satisfactory solution of its difficulties.

9. In discussing S. Paul's relation to this class of literature it is necessary to bear in mind the caution against the identification of literary resemblance with direct borrowing already observed. None the less there is in certain cases clear evidence not only that he was familiar with one of the apocalyptic writings of his time, but that he has borrowed directly from it. This work is *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. In 1 Thess. ii. 16 the clause *ἔφθασεν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος* is an almost verbal reproduction of *Test. Lev.* vi. 11 (*ἔφθασε δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς τέλος*). Similarly in Ro. i. 32 the clause *οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσιν* is a not quite accurate quotation of *Test. Ash.* vi. 2, *ὅτι καὶ πράσσουσι τὸ κακόν, καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσιν.*

In view of these two direct quotations it is fairly clear that in other passages the striking similarity between S. Paul's ideas and those of the author of the *Testaments* may be due to direct borrowing on the part of S. Paul. Of these the most noticeable are the following:

Gal. i. 12. *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπων παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*	*Test. Gad* v. 8. *καὶ οὐκ ἔμαθεν ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τοῦτο ἀλλ' οἶδε διὰ μετανοίας.*
Gal. iii. 19. *διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου.*	*Test. Dan.* vi. 2. *ὅτι οὗτός (ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ παραιτούμενος ὑμᾶς) ἐστι μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων.*
Gal. vi. 8. *ὁ σπείρων...ζωὴν αἰώνιον.*	*Test. Lev.* xiii. 6. *καὶ σπείρατε ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἀγαθὰ καὶ εὑρήσετε αὐτὰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ὑμῶν. ἐὰν δὲ σπείρητε πονηρά, πᾶσαν ταραχὴν καὶ θλῖψιν θερίσετε.*
1 Cor. xiii. 4. *ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ.*	*Test. Gad* iv. 7. *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀγάπης ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ συνεργεῖ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ.*
[1 Cor. xiii. 5. *οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν.*	*Test. Zab.* viii. 5. *μὴ λογίζεσθε ἕκαστος κακίαν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.*

Here however it is probable that S. Paul and the writer of the *Testaments* have borrowed independently from Zech. viii. 17, where the LXX reads *καὶ ἕκαστος τὴν κακίαν τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ μὴ λογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.*]

1 Thess. v. 6. For the common Pauline contrast of day and night in a spiritual sense cf. Ro. xiii. 11, Col. i. 12, Eph. v. 8. (See also the parallel to 2 Cor. vi. 14 given below.)

Test. Jud. xviii. 6. *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὡς ἐν νυκτὶ πορεύεται. Napht.* ii. 10. *οὕτως οὐδὲ ἐν σκότει ὄντες δύνασθε ποιεῖν ἔργα φωτός.* (Cf. *Test. Gad* v. 7 quoted below.)

2 Cor. iv. 4. *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κ.τ.λ.*

Test. Sym. ii. 7. *ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πλάνης καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ζήλου ἐτύφλωσέ μου τὸν νοῦν.*

Test. Lev. iv. 3. *φῶς γνώσεως φωτιεῖς ἐν τῷ Ἰακώβ.*

2 Cor. vi. 14. *ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος; τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαρ;*

Test. Lev. xix. 1. *ἐκλέξασθε ἑαυτοῖς ἢ τὸ φῶς ἢ τὸ σκότος, ἢ τὸν νόμον κυρίου ἢ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Βελίαρ.*

2 Cor. vii. 10. *ἡ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον ἐργάζεται.*

Test. Gad v. 7. *ἡ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν ἀληθὴς μετάνοια φυγαδεύει τὸ σκότος καὶ φωτίζει τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς...καὶ ὁδηγεῖ τὸ διαβούλιον πρὸς σωτηρίαν.*

[Ro. vii. 7. *τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων.*

Test. Iss. vii. 1. *ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι καὶ ἓξ ἐτῶν ὑπάρχω καὶ οὐκ ἔγνων ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτίαν.*

Here in spite of the close verbal similarity the whole sense and context are so different that the resemblance is probably due to mere coincidence.]

Col. iii. 5. *τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία.* (Cf. Eph. v. 5.)

Test. Jud. xix. 1. *ἡ φιλαργυρία πρὸς εἰδωλολατρείαν ὁδηγεῖ.*

[Here the compressed Pauline phrase presupposes the language of the *Testaments*, without which it is hardly intelligible. The idea that covetousness is a form of idolatry is found in Philo, but S. Paul's absolute identification is the effect of the *Testaments*.]

Col. iii. 22. *ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον.*

Test. Reub. iv. 1. *ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου.*

Eph. iv. 15. *ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ.*

Test. Reub. vi. 9. *τοῦ ποιεῖν ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγάπην ἔχειν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.*

Eph. v. 17. *συνίετε τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου.* (Cf. Ro. xii. 2.)

Test. Napht. iii. 1. *συνήσετε τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖν.*

[The close resemblance of Eph. iv. 25 to *Test. Dan.* v. 2 may be due to common borrowing from Zech. viii. 16.]

Phil. ii. 15. *φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ.*

Test. Lev. xiv. 3. *οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ, οἱ φωστῆρες τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.*

A more difficult problem is raised by the question of the relation of S. Paul to the Fourth Book of Esdras. Assuming the correctness of the account of the authorship of the various parts of this work and the dates of their composition given by Box in *The Ezra-Apocalypse* there can be no question of a direct dependence of one on the other, the greater part of the book being later than S. Paul; while in view of its Jewish origin it is impossible to suppose that S. Paul has been drawn upon by the authors. (The extracts given below are from the translation in *Apocr. and Pseud.*) On the other hand the resemblances of thought and language are remarkable.

4 *Esdr.* iii. 7. To him (Adam) thou commandest only one observance of thine, but he transgressed it. Forthwith thou appointedst death for him and for his generations.
iii. 20. And yet thou didst not take away from them (the seed of Jacob) the evil

heart, that thy Law might bring forth fruit in them. For the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise also all who were born of him. Thus the infirmity became inveterate; the Law indeed was in the heart of the people, but in conjunction with the evil germ; so what was good departed and the evil remained.

v. 27. The Law, which thou didst approve out of all laws, thou hast bestowed upon the people whom thou didst desire.

vii. 46. Who is there of those who have come into the world that has not sinned? Or who of the earth-born is there that has not transgressed thy covenant?

vii. 52–60. See the whole of this passage in which the destruction of many who are worthless is justified by the salvation of the few who are righteous, by the comparison of the few to precious stones or metals and the many to lead or clay.

vii. 72. For this reason shall the sojourners in the earth suffer torture, because having understanding they yet wrought iniquity, and receiving precepts they yet kept them not, and having obtained the Law, they yet set at naught that which they received.

[Here it must be noted that the author follows the rabbinical idea that the Law was once offered to the Gentiles and rejected by them; he does not rise to S. Paul's teaching that the revelation of God in nature and conscience should have preserved the Gentiles from the abominations into which they have fallen.]

vii. 116 *seqq*. The whole passage expresses the misery of man, who is born with the prospect of eternal life, which is none the less unattainable in view of the fact that it is impossible for him to avoid sin and the punishment which it entails.

ix. 32. But our fathers, who received the Law, observed it not, and the statutes they did not keep, and yet the fruit of the Law did not perish, nor could it because it was thine; but they who received it perished, because they kept not that which had been sown in them.

It is unnecessary to emphasize the very close resemblance of these ideas with those developed by S. Paul in Romans. In each case the similarity is partly due to the similarity of the difficulty which both writers have to explain, namely the rejection of the Jewish nation in favour of the Gentiles. Both have recourse to the argument of the universality of sin and the right of God to destroy the many for the sake of the few ordained to be saved. There is of course the fundamental difference that the writer of 4 Esdr. is thinking of the rejection as manifested in the downfall of the Temple, while S. Paul sees it in the Jewish refusal of the Gospel and its transference to the Gentiles; but both alike regard the Law as a revelation of righteousness, which condemns those who fall short of it, while leaving them powerless to attain to it. The similarity of ideas is very remarkable, though there is in general no verbal resemblance.

There are, however, in many other passages a considerable number of resemblances of thought and language.

ii. 16. Thou didst set apart Jacob for thyself; but Esau thou didst hate. [Cf. Ro. ix. 13. Here we have a common quotation from Mal. i. 2, but it occurs to prove a similar point, namely God's free choice of those who are to be saved.]

iv. 8. Perchance thou wouldest have said to me: Into the deep have I not descended nor as yet gone down into Hades; neither to heaven have I ever ascended. [Cf. Ro. x. 6. Probably the coincidence of the reference to Deut. xxx. 12 is only accidental.]

iv. 29. Unless therefore that which is sown be reaped, and unless the place where the evil is sown shall have passed away, the field where the good is sown cannot come. [Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 35 *seqq*.]

v. 42. I will liken my judgment to a ring; just as there is no retardation of them that are last, even so there is no hastening of those that are first. [Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 15.]

vii. 89. They painfully served the Most High and were in jeopardy every hour. [Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 30.]

vii. 96. They see the straitness and painfulness from which they are delivered, and the spacious liberty which they are destined to receive with enjoyment and immortality. [Cf. Ro. viii. 21 and the whole thought of the passage in 4 Esdr. with that of 2 Cor. iv. 7–v. 10.]

vii. 127. This is the condition of the contest which every man who is born upon earth must wage; that if he be overcome, he shall suffer as thou hast said: but, if he be victorious, he shall receive what I have said. [Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 25, Phil. iii. 14, 2 Tim. ii. 5. It may be noted that the whole conception of a race is far more natural in 4 Esdr., where the writer expects few to be saved, than in S. Paul, whose system of theology is really inconsistent with the comparison of salvation to the prizes in a race which at the best can be won by few.]

x *passim*. [The whole conception of the earthly Jerusalem as a woman, and the type of a heavenly city to be revealed hereafter, recalls Gal. iv. 24.]

It seems clear that the various resemblances pointed out above cannot be due to any direct dependence. On the other hand they are too numerous to be purely accidental. It can only be inferred that both writers draw on ideas or literature current in Pharisaical circles during the first century A.D. For evidence that this was the case cf. Box, *op. cit.* c. iv. It is however to be noted that S. Paul's dissatisfaction with the Jewish system as a means of attaining righteousness was arrived at independently; it may be doubted how far his difficulties would have been felt within orthodox Judaism if Jerusalem had not fallen. In any case, however, it is clear that the conceptions referred to above are partly taken over from the best Judaism of his time, and partly such as were bound to arise in the mind of the orthodox Pharisee, if for any reason he became dissatisfied with the existing Jewish system.

The book of Enoch, which was used by the author of the *Testaments* and is freely referred to in that work, is never directly quoted by S. Paul, a fact which is the more striking in view of its popularity with other early Christian writers. A list of parallels between Enoch and the N.T. is given in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 181. The parallels quoted between Enoch and the Pauline Epistles are, however, misleading, since they take no account of the independent use of other sources. Thus the not very striking resemblance between 2 Cor. iv. 6 and 1 En. xxxviii. 4 is accidental, the Pauline phrase being borrowed, if at all, from *Test. Lev.* iv. 3 (see above). The parallel between Col. ii. 3 and 1 En. xlvi. 3 would be worth noting, were it not that both are obviously inspired by Prov. ii. 3, 4, while 1 Thess. v. 3 and 1 En. lxii. 4 can be traced back equally to Ps. xlviii. 6, if any source be required for an idea which might easily occur to both writers without conscious reminiscence of any source at all. Similarly 1 Tim. vi. 15 and 1 En. ix. 4 are drawn from such passages as Deut. x. 17 and Dan. ii. 47. It might almost be inferred that S. Paul either did not know Enoch (which seems hardly possible), or, if he knew it, did not for some reason approve of it, since he seems rather to avoid it, as compared with the *Testaments*, although his theology is in many respects similar to Enoch's. The remainder of the resemblances do not amount to anything more than would be expected from two writers moving in a common circle of ideas. For points of contact between S. Paul and other apocalyptic writers reference may be made to the introductions to the writings of this class published in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. The resemblances would seem in most if not all cases to be due to the fact that S. Paul and the authors draw on a more or less common set of ideas. It must be remembered that this literature contains a great deal of more or less conventional imagery, ultimately drawn from the O.T., which S. Paul introduces into his own apocalyptic passages. Thus the conception of the Heavenly Jerusalem as a city hidden in heaven until the end of all things implied in Gal. iv. 26 is found in 4 Esdr. vii. 26, 2 Bar. iv, 1 En. xc. 29 (cf. also c. 1. n. 24). The sudden introduction of straw and stubble in 1 Cor. iii. 12 is probably attributable to the common metaphor of fire burning straw as a description of the day of judgment. Cf. Mal. iv. 1, 1 En. xlviii. 9. It is worth noticing that James in *Lost Apocrypha of the O.T.*, p. 90, gives reasons for supposing that the idea of a discriminating fire which destroys the wicked, but leaves the righteous unhurt, found in Clem. Alex. *Paed.* III. viii. 44, is taken by him from some lost apocalyptic work. Clearly the conception of such a fire underlies this passage in 1 Cor.

It need hardly be pointed out that in the details of the scenery of the Second Coming S. Paul follows closely the general lines of Jewish apocalyptic. The conventional pictures of this class of literature are derived from the O.T. (cf. Is. xxvii. 13, Zech. ix. 14, Ps. lxviii. 17, etc.). For apocalyptic resemblances to 1 Cor. xv. 51,

1 Thess. v. 13, cf. 4 Esdr. vi. 23, 1 En. xlvii. 3, *Apoc. Moys.* xxii and xxxvii (included in *Adam and Eve*). For the appearance of such conventional pictures in rabbinical literature cf. *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 130.

10. For the spiritual side of the teaching of the Pharisees cf. c. I. n. 7 and c. III. § ii. n. 35, and for the difficulty felt by a certain element among the Pharisees owing to the fact that the Law, which should have been the means of attaining holiness, only served in practice to reveal the impossibility of escaping from sin, see the passages from 4 Esdr. and S. Paul quoted above (n. 9). For the belief in rabbinical literature that the constant tendency of man to sin was the result of the fall see the references in *St Paul and Jewish Thought*, pp. 30–40. Although the tendency to elaborate the details of the Law was enormously increased after the fall of Jerusalem, it was inherent in the whole system of Pharisaism, and it was His opposition to this growing tendency that won for Our Lord a great part of His popularity in Galilee (cf. c. I. n. 46).

11. For a general summary of the outlook of the Pharisees in these respects cf. Thackeray, *op. cit.* pp. 98 *seqq.*, *G.J.V.* II. 449 *seqq.*, and Hastings' *D.B.* III. 821, *s.v.* "Pharisees." For the relation of the observance of the Law to the establishment of the Messianic kingdom cf. c. I. n. 52.

12. S. Paul's beliefs with regard to the activities of angels and evil spirits are in general those of the Pharisees of his time. They are modified where necessary to allow for the revolutionary effect which the position of Our Lord has produced on the whole of his theological outlook; but at the same time the old conceptions remain. S. Paul indeed does not attempt to harmonize the new teaching with the old, nor does he give any consistent teaching as to the relations of the various orders of the spiritual hierarchies, whose existence he recognizes; the latter criticism would however apply to all the literature of the period, in which a similar confusion prevails. It is natural that S. Paul should not attempt to introduce any system in the matter, since he deprecates throughout any excessive curiosity about it.

Thus he recognizes the existence of the angelic hierarchy of thrones, dominions, principalities and powers (Col. i. 16, cf. Eph. i. 21). In both of these passages the reference is to the higher orders of angelic servants of God, who meet us in 1 En. lxi. 10, *Test. Lev.* iii. 5 *seqq.*, the more definitely Semitic classes of the former passage being omitted. It would seem from the language of 1 Cor. xv. 40 that the stars are regarded as the visible bodies of celestial beings (cf. 2 Bar. li. 10), who, according to the account of 2 En. xix, xx, are lower than the thrones, dominions, etc., of the earlier references. For the celestial bodies as angels cf. 1 En. xxi. 3, xli. 5, xliii; also Philo, *De Mundi Opif.* 50 (M. I. 34), λογικαὶ θεῖαι φύσεις, αἱ μὲν ἀσώματοι (presumably the higher orders) αἱ δὲ οὐκ ἄνευ σωμάτων, ὁποίους συμβέβηκεν εἶναι τοὺς ἀστέρας. Cf. *De Gigant.* 2 (M. I. 263). Angels appear in the history of Israel, as in Gal. iii. 19, where they are the mediators at the giving of the Law (cf. c. II. n. 33, and see below, c. VI. § ii. n. 19), and in 1 Cor. x. 10, where the "destroyer" is the fiery angel of 4 Macc. vii. 11, and the destroying angel of Wisd. xviii. 25. (It is however possible that Satan acting as God's agent is meant, see below.) Their continued activity appears in 1 Cor. iv. 9, where the angels to whom the sufferings of the Apostles are a spectacle would seem to be those who watch over the course of human affairs in 1 En. ix. 1, cf. 2 Bar. lxvii. 2. It would seem that they are present at the worship of the Church in 1 Cor. xi. 10, where the meaning is that women must not display their beauty out of respect to the angels. The allusion is to the women who led astray the "watchers" in the days before the flood, a legend which is of course a commonplace of later Jewish literature, especially the Enoch literature (for the adornment of the hair as a form of attraction cf. *Test. Reub.* v. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 3). Tertullian, *De Virg. Velan.* vii, regards the angels referred to as being those who fell on that occasion; it seems however rather doubtful whether the Corinthians would have understood the allusion. No doubt the legend was present to S. Paul's own mind, but probably he merely reminds the readers that the angels are present at their worship, and must be treated with reverence. It is not necessary to suppose that S. Paul has in view here evil spirits, or angels, whose probation is not yet finished, and who may be led astray as the watchers once were.

It is perhaps possible that this presence of the angels at Christian worship is connected with their activities implied in 1 Cor. xiii. 1, where S. Paul seems to contemplate the possibility of a "speech with tongues" being uttered in the language of angels, presumably because an angel is speaking through the mouth of the Christian. (For the "tongues of angels" cf. the story of R. Jochanan ben Zaccai quoted in *Hor. Hebr.* on this passage.) For the view that prophecy might be mediated by an angel cf. Acts xxiii. 9, and in non-biblical writings the part played by angels in the visions of Enoch and Ezra as described in the books which bear their names, and 2 Bar. lv. 3, where we meet with "the angel Ramiel, who presides over true visions." The view that these supernatural manifestations are in some cases the work of angels may perhaps be implied in the use of the plural πνεύματα in 1 Cor. xii. 10 and xiv. 12 and 32. It is difficult to reconcile this belief with the teaching of xii. 11 that there is only one Spirit, except in so far as some manifestations are the work of evil spirits, but a similar conception is found in 1 Jno. iv. 2, where it is clear that there are classes of spirits which are of God, and others which are not. The explanation would seem to be that S. Paul here has not harmonized his earlier conceptions with his later to such an extent as to be able to eliminate entirely from his language, and to a certain degree from his thought, the belief that such manifestations are communicated by angels: presumably, if pressed, he would have held that though in some cases mediated by such agencies, yet they are ultimately derived from the one Spirit of God. Hence he is not entirely consistent. The belief that the angels witness the worship of the Church in general is a natural inference from the belief that they present the prayers of men to God, which appears in Tobit xii. 12, *Test. Lev.* iii. 5, and in a singularly crude form in 3 Bar. xi. 4 *seqq.*

There is a similar hierarchy of the spirits of evil. Their chief is Satan, or in one passage Beliar (2 Cor. vi. 15). This passage however is possibly a reminiscence of *Test. Lev.* xix. 1; but it is likely that S. Paul would have used either name indifferently, as does the author of the *Testaments*. Although he is himself evil, he is none the less an agent of God (2 Cor. xii. 7), and his powers can be used by the Apostles to punish evildoers (1 Cor. v. 5 and 1 Tim. i. 20). This conception corresponds to that of *Jub.* x. 8, where Mastema, the chief of the spirits of evil, is allowed to retain a certain number of evil spirits, in order to be able to perform his proper task of leading astray the wicked. Cf. xlix. 2, where the "powers of Mastema" slay the firstborn of the Egyptians on the night of the Passover. It may be noted that in the former of these two passages the evil spirits seem to have special powers over the body, and therefore Noah and his sons are taught spells to counteract their influence. This power is clearly contemplated in the Pauline passages, where the power of Satan is exercised in the infliction of bodily injury. Elsewhere, however, he acts in opposition to the will of God, as in 1 Thess. ii. 18, and the passages in which he tempts or deceives the faithful. His abode is in the middle air (Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12), as in 2 En. xxix. 5. (Cf. references in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 447 *ad loc.*) Below Satan is a hierarchy of angels, similar to that of the good angels (Ro. viii. 38, 1 Cor. xv. 24, where, as the subsequent verses show, we are dealing with a hierarchy which is hostile to God, Eph. vi. 12.) For this compare 1 En. lxix. 3 and the powers of Mastema in *Jubilees*.

These hostile angels, like Satan their chief, endeavour to pervert the Christian from his faith, and so deprive him of his reward. This is clear from Ro. viii. 38, and seems to be implied in 1 Cor. xii. 10 and 1 Thess. v. 19 *seqq.*, where the gift of "discernment of spirits," and the need of "proving all things" following immediately on the command not to depreciate spiritual manifestations, refer to the need of examining all spiritual revelations, and rejecting those that come from spirits of evil. Their functions of tempting and deceiving are of course, like the same functions in the case of Satan himself, those normally associated with the powers of evil in contemporary literature. Cf. the note on *Test. Reub.* ii. 1 in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 296. More remarkable is their association with the ordering of the temporal affairs of the world. This appears in 1 Cor. ii. 6 *seqq.*, where the "rulers of this world," who through their ignorance of the hidden mysteries of the wisdom of God were guilty of crucifying the Lord of glory, and who are even now being brought to an end, would seem to be the angels set over the kingdoms of the world

rather than any actual rulers. This interpretation is confirmed by 1 Cor. xv. 24, where the "authorities" who are to be subdued at the end of all things are clearly supernatural enemies, of whom death is the last. The mystery of redemption was indeed before the Crucifixion hidden from the angelic powers (Eph. iii. 10), but in the passages in 1 Cor. we are dealing with a different class of spiritual beings, who are described in Eph. vi. 12 as the world-rulers of this darkness, *i.e.* the realm of darkness of Col. i. 13. For the whole of this conception cf. Dan. x. 13, *Jub.* xv. 31, and the Hebrew *Test. Napht.* printed as an appendix to the *Testaments* in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 361 (ix. 1 *seqq.*). (For the relation of these spiritual beings to the gods of the heathen see n. 13.) At the Second Coming this hierarchy of evil spirits will be brought to an end after a final judgment. For this cf. 1 En. x, xvi, 2 En. vii. 1 *seqq.*, and for their judgment as entrusted to the Elect One, 1 En. lv. 4, *Test. Lev.* xviii. 12. For the share of the Saints in this judgment (1 Cor. vi. 3) cf. their position at the judgment in 1 En. xxxviii. 1, etc. Their position is, however, considerably enlarged in S. Paul, since they appear as judges and not merely as spectators; it appears to be similar to that awarded to Enoch in *Jub.* iv. 23 *seqq.*, 2 En. xl. 13. For this belief cf. Wisd. iii. 8, where the righteous judge the wicked, and the isolated fragment at the end of 1 Enoch (cviii. 12). If the angels are also to be judged, it is natural that the righteous should judge them no less than wicked men. For the belief that the mystery of redemption was unknown to the angelic powers, whether good or evil, cf. 1 En. xvi. 3, xxxviii. 3, xlix. 4, lxii. 7, 1 Pet. i. 12.

13. S. Paul's view of the idols of the heathen is an attempt to combine two contradictory beliefs, which appear in the O.T., and also in later Jewish writings. Thus in Deut. xxxii. 17 and Ps. cvi. 37 sacrifices offered to idols are offered to devils; in Ps. cxv the idols of the heathen are simply the works of men's hands and nothing more. So in Ro. i. 23 idols are nothing. The passage 1 Cor. viii. 5 is more difficult, since while an idol is nothing and there is no God but one, yet there are many gods and many lords. Possibly the word λεγόμενοι should be understood in the latter clause, and therefore we should understand the phrase to mean "there are many alleged gods and alleged lords who are really nothing." In x. 16 *seqq.* however it is clear that S. Paul's argument depends for its force on the belief that a sacrifice offered to an idol is offered to a real being, namely, a devil; it would seem that he is meeting the argument that for a Christian who knows that an idol is nothing, there can be no harm in attending a heathen banquet, since it is offered to a non-existent being, and he does so by the argument that it is in fact offered to real and evil beings. This casts a certain doubt on the meaning of viii. 5, a doubt which is supported by 2 iv. 4, where Satan, or some inferior evil spirit, is described as "the God of this world." In 1 Cor. xii. 2 and Gal. iv. 8 it is doubtful whether S. Paul means that the beings whom his reader served were mere nonentities or were evil spirits, in the one case leading men astray to worship dumb idols, in the other case real beings, but not gods.

A similar ambiguity is found in the *Testaments*. Thus in *Test. Napht.* iii. 3 the idols of the Gentiles are described as "stocks and stones, spirits of deceit." So in *Jub.* xi. 4 the sons of Noah are seduced by evil spirits into worshipping the molten images which they had made for themselves, the latter phrase being adopted from the view that idols are merely the work of men's hands and not representative of real beings. In xxii. 17, however, the Gentiles are said to offer their sacrifices to the dead and to worship evil spirits. Yet still they "err in saying to a piece of wood: 'Thou art my God,' and to a stone: 'Thou art my Lord.'" The explanation would seem to be that while the effects of idolatry on the heathen were regarded as the result of diabolical influence, yet the argument against idolatry that it was the worship of the work of men's hands was too valuable to be lightly abandoned. Consequently both views are put forward at different points by Jewish writers without any attempt at a formal synthesis.

It may be noted that Philo distinguishes between worship offered to sun and moon and the forces of nature on the one hand, and worship offered to idols on the other (*De Mon.* i. 1, 2, M. II. 213–15). Worship offered to the former is offered not to nonentities but to spiritual powers, which govern the objects to which such worship is offered. Its error lies in the fact that the objects worshipped are spirits subordinate to God, not God Himself. Among the creatures so worshipped are

It is perhaps possible that this presence of the angels at Christian worship is connected with their activities implied in 1 Cor. xiii. 1, where S. Paul seems to contemplate the possibility of a "speech with tongues" being uttered in the language of angels, presumably because an angel is speaking through the mouth of the Christian. (For the "tongues of angels" cf. the story of R. Jochanan ben Zaccai quoted in *Hor. Hebr.* on this passage.) For the view that prophecy might be mediated by an angel cf. Acts xxiii. 9, and in non-biblical writings the part played by angels in the visions of Enoch and Ezra as described in the books which bear their names, and 2 Bar. lv. 3, where we meet with "the angel Ramiel, who presides over true visions." The view that these supernatural manifestations are in some cases the work of angels may perhaps be implied in the use of the plural πνεύματα in 1 Cor. xii. 10 and xiv. 12 and 32. It is difficult to reconcile this belief with the teaching of xii. 11 that there is only one Spirit, except in so far as some manifestations are the work of evil spirits, but a similar conception is found in 1 Jno. iv. 2, where it is clear that there are classes of spirits which are of God, and others which are not. The explanation would seem to be that S. Paul here has not harmonized his earlier conceptions with his later to such an extent as to be able to eliminate entirely from his language, and to a certain degree from his thought, the belief that such manifestations are communicated by angels: presumably, if pressed, he would have held that though in some cases mediated by such agencies, yet they are ultimately derived from the one Spirit of God. Hence he is not entirely consistent. The belief that the angels witness the worship of the Church in general is a natural inference from the belief that they present the prayers of men to God, which appears in Tobit xii. 12, *Test. Lev.* iii. 5, and in a singularly crude form in 3 Bar. xi. 4 *seqq.*

There is a similar hierarchy of the spirits of evil. Their chief is Satan, or in one passage Beliar (2 Cor. vi. 15). This passage however is possibly a reminiscence of *Test. Lev.* xix. 1; but it is likely that S. Paul would have used either name indifferently, as does the author of the *Testaments*. Although he is himself evil, he is none the less an agent of God (2 Cor. xii. 7), and his powers can be used by the Apostles to punish evildoers (1 Cor. v. 5 and 1 Tim. i. 20). This conception corresponds to that of *Jub.* x. 8, where Mastema, the chief of the spirits of evil, is allowed to retain a certain number of evil spirits, in order to be able to perform his proper task of leading astray the wicked. Cf. xlix. 2, where the "powers of Mastema" slay the firstborn of the Egyptians on the night of the Passover. It may be noted that in the former of these two passages the evil spirits seem to have special powers over the body, and therefore Noah and his sons are taught spells to counteract their influence. This power is clearly contemplated in the Pauline passages, where the power of Satan is exercised in the infliction of bodily injury. Elsewhere, however, he acts in opposition to the will of God, as in 1 Thess. ii. 18, and the passages in which he tempts or deceives the faithful. His abode is in the middle air (Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12), as in 2 En. xxix. 5. (Cf. references in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 447 *ad loc.*) Below Satan is a hierarchy of angels, similar to that of the good angels (Ro. viii. 38, 1 Cor. xv. 24, where, as the subsequent verses show, we are dealing with a hierarchy which is hostile to God, Eph. vi. 12.) For this compare 1 En. lxix. 3 and the powers of Mastema in *Jubilees*.

These hostile angels, like Satan their chief, endeavour to pervert the Christian from his faith, and so deprive him of his reward. This is clear from Ro. viii. 38, and seems to be implied in 1 Cor. xii. 10 and 1 Thess. v. 19 *seqq.*, where the gift of "discernment of spirits," and the need of "proving all things" following immediately on the command not to depreciate spiritual manifestations, refer to the need of examining all spiritual revelations, and rejecting those that come from spirits of evil. Their functions of tempting and deceiving are of course, like the same functions in the case of Satan himself, those normally associated with the powers of evil in contemporary literature. Cf. the note on *Test. Reub.* ii. 1 in *Apocr. and Pseud.* II. 296. More remarkable is their association with the ordering of the temporal affairs of the world. This appears in 1 Cor. ii. 6 *seqq.*, where the "rulers of this world," who through their ignorance of the hidden mysteries of the wisdom of God were guilty of crucifying the Lord of glory, and who are even now being brought to an end, would seem to be the angels set over the kingdoms of the world

the Jerusalem which is above is the heavenly city, which is to be revealed in due time, as in 4 Esdr. But S. Paul's identification of the earthly Jerusalem with Mount Sinai is based on the belief that the three holy places of the world are the Garden of Eden, Mount Zion the centre of the earth, and Mount Sinai the centre of the desert, the three being created facing one another. This belief appears in *Jub.* viii. 19, and also (with a fourth Mountain of the East) in iv. 26. S. Paul makes use of their "correspondence" (*συνστοιχεῖ*) with one another in the scheme of creation to identify the existing Jerusalem with Sinai, the place where the existing Jewish Law of bondage was given; while Sinai in turn is identified with Hagar on the strength of the expulsion of Hagar into the wilderness of Sinai. Thus Hagar represents Mount Sinai and the Law of bondage, and Sinai, as the Jews admit, "corresponds" to the present Jerusalem. Sarah represents the covenant of promise, which belongs to the true Israel, whose home is the heavenly Jerusalem. The whole story of Sarah and Hagar seems to have been a favourite with allegorizers of the Law and S. Paul's treatment of the incident shows a resemblance to that of Philo (see Appendix). This resemblance is probably due to the use of a common allegorical tradition, complicated in S. Paul's case by the use of the legend referred to above.

For a further reference to rabbinical legend implied in the use of the word *ἐδίωκεν* cf. Driver in Hastings' *D.B.* II. 503, Art. "Ishmael."

15. See Appendix to this Chapter.

16. S. Paul's knowledge of Gentile literature of the classical type, as revealed in Acts xvii. 28, and 1 Cor. xv. 33, does not involve anything more than the possession of a small stock of conventional quotations useful for a Jewish preacher addressing a Gentile audience in the synagogue. Similarly the quotation from Epimenides in Tit. i. 12, if genuine, might easily be picked up in Corinth from a Greek convert who had heard of his intention of evangelizing Crete. S. Paul's address at Athens, which is probably based on genuine reminiscences of his methods of addressing an educated Gentile audience, is simply the conventional language of a Hellenistic Jew who is attempting to harmonize Jewish monotheism with Greek philosophy. Cf. the following parallels.

Acts xvii. 25. Cf. Philo, *De Vict. Off.* 3 (M. II. 253), *κτήματα γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα κεκτημένος, ὅμως οὐδενὸς δεῖται.* (Cf. *De Vit. Moys.* i. 28, M. II. 105.) (For *χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς* cf. c. II. n. 37.)

vv. 25[b], 26. Wisd. xiii. 3 *seqq.*, Philo, *De Mon.* i. 1 (M. II. 214), Frag. *De Mundo* 1 (M. II. 601). For *ἐποίησεν ἐξ ἑνὸς ἔθνους* cf. the Jewish Pseudo-Phocylides incorporated in *Or. Sib.* II. 107.

v. 27. Cf. Philo, *De Poenit.* 2 (M. II. 406). (Cf. App. I for the parallel to Ro. x. 6.)

v. 28. Cf. Philo, *De Sacr. Ab. et Cain*, 18 (M. I. 175), *De Conf. Ling.* 27 (M. I. 425).

v. 29 is, of course, a commonplace. The speech at Lystra is even more conventional.

17. Cf. above, c. I. nn. 53, 54, 57. S. Paul's liberalism in Ro. ii. 12 *seqq.*, where he recognizes that the righteous Gentile is in as good a position as the Jew who keeps the Law, can hardly be paralleled, but is probably to be attributed to his conversion.

18. Cf. c. II. n. 48.

19. Gal. iii. 23 *seqq.*, Ro. iv. 1, v. 12 *seqq.*, Acts xiii. 16 *seqq.*, etc. S. Paul's method of using the O.T., whether as type or as allegory, is of course entirely in keeping with the method familiar to Hellenistic Judaism (see Appendix I). Its object is different, since it aims at commending Christianity and not Judaism; while it also differs in respect of those to whom it is addressed. Wisdom and the writings of Philo are intended to convert to Judaism either lapsed Jews of the Dispersion or Gentiles, and therefore aim at vindicating the claim of the O.T. to be a divine revelation. S. Paul assumes throughout both that his audience accept the O.T. and also that they regard it as possessing a spiritual or allegorical meaning as well as a literal one. Apart from his speeches at Athens and Lystra, which are of a conventional Hellenistic Jewish type, so far as they go, we have no evidence as to the method in which he would have approached a purely Gentile audience, which did not recognize the authority of the O.T. The foundations of his theology are so thoroughly Jewish that it is doubtful whether he would have found it easy to commend it to those who did not already regard Judaism with some measure of

veneration. It may be presumed that he would have employed the methods generally in use among the Jews in dealing with their Gentile adherents, for which see c. I. n. 53.

20. For the relation of S. Paul's conception of Our Lord to the divine pattern or idea of man, which is practically the equivalent of the λόγος, see Appendix I, and for the description of the Messiah as the πρωτότοκος cf. Lightfoot on Col. i. 15. The transition from the conception of the divine idea of man or the πρωτόγονος λόγος, also regarded as the πρεσβύτατος υἱός of God to the Messiah, regarded as the πρωτότοκος, would thus be easy. It may however be questioned whether the identification of the Messiah and the λόγος is not pre-Christian. In *Leg. Alleg.* i. 16 (M. 1. 53) Philo explains the duplication of the statement that God put man into Paradise, in Gen. ii. 8 and 15, by pointing out that in the former passage it is the man whom He formed (ἔπλασεν), in the latter the man whom He had made (ἐποίησεν). The former is, in accordance with his usual convention, actual, created man, who is πλαστός, the latter the idea or pattern; ὥστε δύο ἀνθρώπους εἰς τὸν παράδεισον εἰσάγεσθαι, τ�ον μὲν πεπλασμένον τὸν δὲ κατ' εἰκόνα. ὁ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν γεγονὼς οὐ μόνον ἐν ταῖς φυτουργίαις τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐξετάζεται ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐργάτης ἐστὶν αὐτῶν καὶ φύλαξ...ὁ δὲ πλαστὸς οὐδὲ ἐργάζεται οὐδὲ φυλάττει ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰσάγεται...μέλλων αὐτίκα φυγὰς ἀρετῆς ἔσεσθαι. διὰ τοῦτο ὃν μὲν μόνον τίθησιν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ πλαστὸν καλεῖ· ὃν δὲ καὶ ἐργάτην καὶ φύλακα ἀποδείκνυσιν οὐ πλαστὸν ἀλλ' ὃν ἐποίησε. Here ὁ κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν is as elsewhere the λόγος.

In Philo there is of course no identification of the λόγος and the Messiah; and Paradise is purely a symbolical conception. On the other hand in Jewish thought Paradise, *i.e.* the Garden of Eden removed to some extra-mundane sphere, appears as the abode of Adam (*Apoc. Moys.* xxxvii. 5) until the final judgment, as it is of Enoch in *Jub.* iv. 23. (Here Paradise is situated in the third heaven, as in 2 En. viii, ix, where it is an abode for the righteous.) The same conception of Eden as an abode for the righteous, including Adam, appears in 1 En. lx. 8. Now elsewhere in 1 En. (*e.g.* xxxix. 6[a], xlviii) the dwelling-place of the Messiah and the righteous before the final judgment are identical. Thus the Messiah's abode is in Paradise; and the fact that Philo places the abode of the λόγος in a symbolical Paradise may well be due to his having borrowed from earlier literature, which had already identified the λόγος as the divine prototype of Adam with the Messiah and left him in Paradise when the historical Adam was expelled, at the same time regarding Paradise as the abode of the Messiah and the righteous, including the historical Adam, until the Final Consummation. It seems not improbable that here S. Paul and Philo are working independently on a common basis, which was less allegorical than Philo. In the same way, S. Paul, while identifying Our Lord with the prototype of Adam or the divine image of man, also identifies Paradise with the third heaven in 2 Cor. xii. 2 *seqq.*, and thinks in Phil. i. 23 of the dead, at least the martyrs, as being "with Christ," while according to Lk. xxiii. 43 they are in Paradise (cf. Rev. ii. 7). (For the rabbinical belief that the souls of the righteous are in Paradise cf. *Hor. Hebr.* on Lk. xxiii. 43.) Thus Paradise is the abode of Our Lord as the Messiah and divine prototype of man or λόγος (presumably until the Final Consummation).

21. This is implied in the fact that in 1 Cor. xv. 45 *seqq.* Our Lord is the "second Man" or the "last Adam." Strictly speaking the description of Him in the terms used by S. Paul in this passage is only applicable to Him as the first man, the prototype of Adam; but S. Paul here is referring to the order of temporal manifestation (see Appendix I). In Gal. iv. 4 He is described in language suitable to the pre-existing Messiah, His position as the divine type of humanity being ignored.

For the Jewish belief in the pre-existence of the Messiah cf. *G.J.V.* II. 616.

22. Gal. iii. 13, cf. also Col. i. 20 *seqq.*, ii. 13 *seqq.*, Eph. ii. 14 *seqq.* S. Paul obviously attaches to the curse of Deut. xxi. 23 a special significance in relation to Our Lord's sufferings, and the same thought underlies the use of the phrase κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου in Acts x. 39. Cf. *Tr. San. M.* vi. 4[b] for the belief that the death of the Cross was in a peculiar sense accursed, and the effect of this belief on the theory of the legal method of executing the sentence. It is noticeable that according to the *Tosefta* ix. 6[b] the reason for removing the corpse at once from the Cross was that this mode of execution was an insult to man as the image of God.

For the treatment of Deut. xxi. 23 by Philo cf. Appendix I; and for the difficulty which the death of Our Lord by the Cross caused to the Jews cf. 1 Cor. i. 23, and Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 89.

23. Ro. v. 12 *seqq.*, 1 Cor. xv. 21, Col. i. 16 *seqq.* The argument in all these passages is that Our Lord as a greater Adam is typical of mankind, in the same way as Adam, though to an infinitely greater degree. No doubt the point had been made clear in each case during the earlier training of the converts to whom S. Paul writes. The arguments in Romans and 1 Cor. would be entirely unintelligible, unless the readers had already been instructed as to the unique relations in which Our Lord and Adam stand to the rest of mankind, and the power of the merits of Our Lord to atone for the transgression of Adam.

24. Ro. iii. 9, vii, 1 Cor. xv. 56, Gal. iii. 10, Col. ii. 14.

25. For faith and baptism as identical, in the sense that the one is the internal condition and the other the visible sign which ratifies it, cf. Gal. iii. 26.

It is of course merely owing to the attempt to read post-reformation theology into the text of the Pauline Epistles that S. Paul's teaching on the subject of justification has been interpreted as referring to an imputation of righteousness. S. Paul's whole position rests on the claim that the Law could not produce righteousness, whereas Christianity in fact did enable the believer to become righteous. Thus in Gal. ii. 15 the whole argument is that the Gentiles are as good as or better than the Jews, since they by faith accompanied by baptism have attained to that state of holiness which was symbolized by circumcision and enjoined by the Law, but could not be conveyed by it. Thus the Gentile converts are in fact righteous and not sinners; if they were still sinners, it would follow that Christ Himself was a minister of sin, in the sense that His dispensation left men still in a state of sin, from which they needed to be delivered by the observance of the Law. Similarly in Ro. v. 17 the believer has received a gift of righteousness, in virtue of which he is made righteous (*δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί*, *ib.* 19). Again in c. vii S. Paul describes the misery of those who like himself before his conversion realize the ideal, but are unable to live up to it, and contrasts it with the blessedness of those who by conversion have attained to a state of freedom from sin.

This righteousness is indeed imputed to the Christian as a consequence of his initial act of faith, just as it was to Abraham (Ro. iv), but this is only in the sense that it is imputed by a free gift of grace, not earned by his own observance of the Law. It is however a real state of righteousness, *i.e.* an actual attainment of personal holiness, different from anything which the Law could provide, due to the deliverance from the power of sin which is conveyed by baptism. Cf. also Ro. x. 5 *seqq.*, where the implied argument is that Moses writes that if a man wishes to attain to righteousness by the Law, he must keep it (which is impossible), whereas to attain to righteousness by faith is the easiest thing in the world (cf. the use of Deut. xxx. 12 by Philo; the verse was probably a commonplace of Hellenistic Jewish apologetic, intended of course to show the ease of observing the Law).

S. Paul's theology in this respect is the effect of his conversion. That experience had worked a revolution in his nature, which left him free from the continual sense of inability to escape from sin, which was felt by other Jews of his age. (For this feeling in 4 Esdr. cf. n. 9.) The sense of relief from continual struggles to realize an unattainable ideal he attributes to the fact that at his conversion he had been delivered from an old state of sin and given by a free gift of God a new state of righteousness. S. Paul assumes that his own experience at his conversion has been shared by all other Christians, an assumption which led in certain cases to serious difficulties. Practically S. Paul realizes that this initial gift of righteousness has to be perfected in many cases by a laborious process (Ro. viii. 12 and 23). Theologically his system left no room for this necessity, which would have furnished a dangerous weapon to his judaizing opponents. For if the righteousness conferred at baptism is incomplete, it would be arguable that the Law was the proper means for perfecting it.

It should be observed that the conception of faith as the necessary condition of salvation is not peculiar to S. Paul. The justification of the doctrine by an appeal to Gen. xv. 6 is obviously merely rabbinical; it rests on the quite arbitrary selection of an isolated text without reference to the context. But this use of the text is

apparently a commonplace of Jewish thought, since it is common in Philo (see Appendix I). In the post-canonical Jewish writers the word has two main senses. Thus it is used in the sense of faithfulness to the Law in 4 Esdr. v. 1, vi. 5 and although in ix. 7, 8 and xiii. 23 it is coupled with works the phrase seems to mean no more than loyalty to the Law and care in fulfilling its prescriptions; those who have both faith and works are those who both admit the obligation of the Law in theory and are also exact in the practice of it. Cf. 2 Bar. liv. 21. This conception of faith is one which naturally arose in a time of persecution, when the Chosen People were in danger of falling away from the Law on account of persecution. The word is similarly used in 4 Macc. xv. 24, xvii. 2, where, however, it seems to have the additional implication of trust that the righteous will be rewarded in a future life; the usage here is practically that of Heb. xi. In the parable-section of 1 Enoch (xxxvii–lxxi) the conception of faith as an element in righteousness and denial of the name of the Lord of Spirits as a mark of wickedness is common. The righteous are the Pharisees, and the wicked the Sadducees, and faith here comes nearer to its Pauline sense of a right intellectual belief as a motive for conduct, though there is still the conception that this faith is loyalty to true religion as against apostasy (cf. xliii. 4, xlvi. 7, lviii. 5, lxi. 4). It must be observed that the exact connotation of the term naturally varies with the purpose of the writer who uses it. Where his object is to strengthen those who are being persecuted, the sense of fidelity to the Law or belief in the righteousness of God in rewarding those who do not apostatize becomes more prominent; where the writer wishes to convert his hearers to doctrines which they have not hitherto heard, he naturally emphasizes the sense of a right intellectual belief. Hence in Jas ii. 14 it is possible to use it simply in the sense of right belief which has no effect on conduct; the usage is of course a parody of the Pauline, but still a recognizable parody. In Philo the word has the same sense as in S. Paul; faith in God is a virtue just because it is difficult; cf. *Q.R.D.H.* 18 (M. i. 485–6): *μόνῳ Θεῷ χωρὶς ἑτέρου πρὸς παραλήψεως οὐ ῥᾴδιον πιστεῦσαι, διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ θνητὸν ᾧ συνεζεύγμεθα συγγένειαν· ὅπερ ἡμᾶς καὶ χρήμασι καὶ δόξῃ...καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις ἀναπείθει πεπιστευκέναι. Τὸ δὲ ἐκνίψασθαι τούτων ἕκαστον καὶ ἀπιστῆσαι γενέσει τῇ ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἀπίστῳ, μόνῳ δὲ πιστεῦσαι θεῷ τῷ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν μόνῳ πιστῷ, μεγάλης καὶ ὀλυμπίου διανοίας ἔργον ἐστί.* Here the sense of the word is almost exactly the Pauline, *i.e.* a right belief which is the dominating factor of life; the object of faith is different, since Philo is pleading for faith in an abstract conception of God, S. Paul for faith in the person of Our Lord; but the quality is the same. Both use the word in what may be described as the missionary sense; that is, as a description of the act by which we assent to certain doctrines, the acceptance of which involves a more or less complete change in our outlook on life and our mode of conduct. Reitzenstein quotes parallels from Hellenistic mystery-theology, and holds that Philo has been influenced by it. But the conception is a necessity for any propagandist religion and must have been in frequent use in the synagogues of the Dispersion.

(The use of the word in such passages as Mk ii. 5 and the synoptic narratives of Our Lord's miracles seems to correspond to that of 1 Enoch. In that work "faith" is largely faith in the Messianic kingdom, and Our Lord's demand for faith in Himself rests ultimately on His claim to the Messianic title. But the explicit faith demanded is little more than personal belief in His powers of working miracles: here the quality is far more of the nature of an act of the will than of that of intellectual belief.)

26. See Appendix II to this Chapter. Cf. also for the position of the divine prototype of man in the theology of Oriental mystery-cults, Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, 160 *seqq.*

27. 1 Thess. iv. 15 presupposes that death before the Second Coming is to be a rare and exceptional thing. Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 29, xv. 51, Ro. xiii. 11, 1 Thess. v. 3, Phil. iv. 5, for definite expressions of the imminence of the Second Coming.

28. In Ro. ii. 9 S. Paul admits that the Jew has a certain prerogative, which he endeavours to justify in Ro. iii, without very much success. It would seem from Ro. xi. 25 that S. Paul endeavoured to justify his preaching to the Gentiles before the conversion of the whole Jewish nation by the belief that their temporary blindness was permitted by God, in order that the Gentiles might have an opportunity

to hear that Gospel. None the less his practice is invariably to offer the Gospel to the Jews first, even in Rome, where he approaches the authorities of the synagogue on his arrival before meeting the Christians of the city (Acts xxviii. 17). The belief that the Jew had a prior claim if he was worthy to accept it was a natural inference from the belief that the Law was a genuine, though partial, divine revelation, for which the nation had been marked out (Ro. iii. 2). It was also necessary for S. Paul to work through the synagogues of the Dispersion, since it was mainly to their Gentile adherents that he must look for converts. His view of the Gospel was essentially one for Gentiles already interested and instructed in Judaism (cf. n. 19).

29. 1 Cor. ix. 20, Acts xvi. 3, xxi. 24, xxiii. 6.

30. This is implied by Ro. ii. 14, which may be contrasted with the rabbinical view quoted in n. 9 on 4 Esdr. vii. 72, that the Law was in fact promulgated to the Gentiles and rejected by them. For S. Paul's general view on the relation of the Gentiles to the Law cf. Gal. ii. 15–21, iv. 1–9, etc., and for the motives which would naturally predispose him to take the view that the Law could not be imposed on the Gentiles see c. I. n. 61.

31. Ro. iii. 21–iv. 22. The view that righteousness is a free gift of divine grace, and not a reward of the observance of the Law, is the inevitable deduction from the belief that the Law was in fact unable to produce righteousness, since if this inability be admitted, man is clearly without any means of attaining to a state of righteousness in which he could merit anything (cf. nn. 24, 25). In point of fact S. Paul's theology on this matter is open to the criticism that the initial act of faith which leads to conversion is, presumably, the result of man's own free will and therefore is itself a "work," which merits the attainment to righteousness which is its reward. This S. Paul endeavours to meet by the introduction of the view that though it is not in itself an attainment to righteousness, nor yet an action which merits righteousness, yet it is none the less counted as such, as was the faith of Abraham. Obviously this is in fact an evasion of the whole issue, since if it is counted as righteousness, it is presumably so counted because it is in some degree meritorious. Otherwise it can only be a gift of faith which is arbitrarily bestowed by God on some and not on others. This at once opens the door to the argument used by his opponent at iii. 8, to which S. Paul has in fact no satisfactory reply from a logical point of view.

The defence of his position is of course that it does correspond to the fact which is a postulate of Christian experience, that forgiveness of sin and the power to attain to righteousness are a free gift of God, which is given through the death of Our Lord on the Cross, and which the individual could never in fact earn by any action of his own. The fact of Christian consciousness is stated in Ro. iii. 24 *seqq.*, and is one which is difficult to reconcile with any system of theology, which does not end by making salvation a gift of God bestowed in a purely arbitrary fashion on some people and denied to others. S. Paul's system does not solve the difficulty. The discussion of the whole question clearly falls outside the scope of this book. The importance of it lies in the fact that here as elsewhere S. Paul's theology is an attempt to rationalize his own experience, not an attempt to work out a coherent system.

32. See n. 25 above.

33. For the conception of the new life as the indwelling of the Spirit cf. Gal. iii. 5, 14, iv. 6, v. 16 *seqq.*, 1 Cor. ii. 12, iii. 16, vi. 17, 2 i. 22, v. 5, Ro. viii. 2 *seqq.*, Eph. i. 13, iv. 30. For a new risen life of the Christian in Christ (or of Christ in the Christian) see Gal. ii. 20, where Christ lives in the Christian, although he is still actually in the flesh, 2 Cor. v. 17, vi. 16, Ro. vi. 11, viii. 1, 10, xiii. 14, Eph. ii. 5, iii. 17, Phil. i. 21, Col. i. 27, iii. 1. For love or charity as a divine gift which puts the believer into the direct contact with God which S. Paul regards as the essence of the Christian life cf. 1 Cor. xiii, Ro. v. 5, Eph. iii. 19, Phil. i. 9 *seqq.*, Col. iii. 14. At other times S. Paul uses other phrases, *e.g.* "grace" in Ro. v. 21, or a "new creation" in Gal. vi. 15 (cf. 2 Cor. v. 17). The variations in language are due sometimes to the necessity of S. Paul's argument and sometimes represent variations in the intellectual conception in which the sense of unity with God impresses itself on the mind. But the underlying fact is the same, namely a conviction that the believer is in a permanent state of personal union with God, which is for S. Paul the essence of Christianity. In estimating Pauline theology it is always necessary to bear in

mind that it is this sense of unity with God which he is endeavouring to express and which he expects to find in his readers. It is the power to attain to this unity which is true *γνῶσις*. See Appendix II to this section.

34. For the fact that he was, in spite of his Roman citizenship, several times subjected to the punishment of beating from which he could have claimed exemption (2 Cor. xi. 25), see below, c. v. § iii. n. 4.

35. Cf. Appendix I and nn. 16 and 19. It seems probable that the language of 1 Thess. v. 7 and Eph. v. 12 is intended to refer to the mystery-religions of the time. There is a close similarity between these passages and Philo's allusions to these cults in *De Vict. Off.* 12 (M. II. 260), *οὐκ ἀξιῶν τοὺς ἐν τοιαύτῃ πολιτείᾳ τραφέντας...μυστικῶν πραγμάτων ἐκκρεμαμένους ὀλιγωρεῖν ἀληθείας καὶ τὰ νύκτα καὶ σκότος κεκληρωμένα μεταδιώκειν, παρέντας τὰ φωτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἄξια.* Philo proceeds to criticize the mystery-cults with the argument that if they are good they should be made public, and that their secrecy can only be due to the fact that they are evil, an argument which is perhaps traceable to the Greek rather than the Jewish side of his character (cf. Lucian, *Demonax*, 11). The general tone of his allusion to them as works of darkness opposed to works which are worthy of light is probably a commonplace of Hellenistic Jewish arguments against forms of worship which were the main rival of the synagogue, and as such must often have been condemned by the propaganda of the Dispersion.

36. Christianity to S. Paul is always the true version of Judaism, which has superseded the old and incomplete revelation hitherto current. Cf. Gal. iv. 1–7, vi. 16, 1 Cor. x. 1, where he describes the historical Israel as "our fathers," 2 iii. 6 *seqq.*, Ro. xi. 17 *seqq.* (where he is addressing the Gentile converts; naturally he makes the assumption throughout in addressing the Jewish Christians of Rome), Phil. iii. 3, Acts xiii. 41 (where the prophecy of Hab. i. 5 is intended to warn the Jews that they may lose their privilege and be replaced by others as the true Israel), xxiv. 14, xxvi. 22. For the practical importance of the point cf. below, c. vi. § i. n. 26.

37. The extent to which the Judaism of the Dispersion was a proselytizing religion is clear from the fact that it has Gentile adherents wherever S. Paul goes. Cf. also c. i. n. 57 and *G.J.V.* III. 150 *seqq.* For its activity at Rome cf. c. vi. § i. n. 9 and § iv. It must be remembered that this activity of the Jews was carried on in the face of great opposition both from public authorities and considerable sections of the general public. Instances of this will meet us in many of the scenes of Pauline activity and are discussed below; the success achieved in the face of this opposition shows that the Jew of the Dispersion was normally a vigorous propagandist. It must be remembered further that S. Paul had lived in Palestine during the time when public feeling was being continually roused to fanatical enthusiasm for the Law by the insults offered to it by Pontius Pilate (c. i. n. 16), and that he was in close touch with Antioch, the seat of the Roman government in Syria, at the time when Petronius, the legate of the province, was under orders from Caligula to set up his statue in the Temple. (See below, c. v. § ii. n. 2.) He was thus influenced not only by the propagandist zeal of the Jews of the Dispersion, but by the indignation aroused among the Jews of Palestine by the insults offered to their faith, an indignation which was to vent itself ultimately in the Jewish rebellion. The circumstances of the time could hardly fail to make any Jew, who had not wholly abandoned his religion, either a vigorous propagandist or a violent nationalist. For S. Paul's violent hatred of heathenism cf. Ro. i. 18 *seqq.*, 1 Cor. vi. 9, and similar passages, and the apocalyptic outburst of 2 Thess. ii. 3 *seqq.* For the militant fanaticism of his character cf. 2 Cor. x. 3, Eph. vi. 11, and such outbursts as 1 Thess. ii. 15, Gal. v. 12, Phil. iii. 2, 19.

38. For S. Paul's natural weakness of health cf. Gal. iv. 13, 2 Cor. xii. 7. (It is not clear whether 1 Cor. ii. 3 refers to bodily weakness or to mental anxiety.)

For the hardships which accompanied his labours cf. 2 Cor. xi. 23, and see also 1 iv. 11, Phil. iv. 12. It must be remembered that at Corinth and Thessalonica (here only for a brief period) S. Paul was working for his living as well as preaching. According to Acts xx. 34 he did so at Ephesus also, but it is possible that this is an error. (See below, c. vii. § ii. n. 20.)

For his practice of voluntary austerities cf. 1 Cor. ix. 26.

39. See for instance 1 Cor. ii. 3 and the astounding fluctuations of temperament revealed in 2 i. 3–11, or again the effect of persecution on his state of mind as shown by 1 Thess. ii. 2.

40. Cf. the change from indignation at the opening of Galatians and in iii. 1 to affection in Gal. iv. 12, or the longing for the conversion of the Jews expressed in Ro. ix. 3 as contrasted with the language of Phil. iii. 2 or 1 Thess. ii. 15. In general we may contrast the affection of such passages as 1 Thess. ii. 7 *seqq.*, and Phil. iv. 1, or the identification of the divine love which is the new life of the Christian with the love which is due from one Christian to another in daily life in 1 Cor. xiii, to the passionate condemnation which he bestows on his opponents in such passages as those from 1 Thess. and Philippians referred to above. Nor are these extreme or isolated instances, cf. Gal. vi. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 13. S. Paul's conception of charity certainly does not prevent him from a quite unrestrained denunciation of those who oppose or interfere with his work.

41. Cf. Acts xvi. 3, xxi. 26, 1 Cor. ix. 19 *seqq.*, and see c. VII. § iii. nn. 18 and 35. So in Gal. ii. 2 he is quite prepared to submit his teaching to the older Apostles, as he is quite prepared to appear at the Council of Jerusalem. That he would have yielded to an adverse decision is incredible. The only point on which he may have made a serious surrender is in allowing Titus to be circumcised (cf. c. v. § iii. nn. 17, 19). His diplomacy is however still more marked in the matter of the collection for the Jewish Christians and the difficulty arising out of it at Corinth (c. VII. § iv. nn. 36–39).

42. Cf. Gal. ii. 11 *seqq.*, 1 Cor. iv. 21, v. 4, 13, xi. 16, 34^{b}, 2 x. 11, xii. 14, 21, xiii. 10. The old fires are dying out, but are none the less distinctly to be traced in the letter to Philemon.

43. *B.J.* II. xx. 2.

44. c. II. nn. 19, 20 and 47.

45. Acts ix. 23, 2 Cor. xi. 32. That the mission was not very successful seems probable for the reasons given in the text and from the fact that we hear nothing of any attempt to revisit Damascus on S. Paul's part.

46. The narrative of Acts ix. 26 differs somewhat seriously from that of Gal. i. 18 and must be regarded as to some extent erroneous. It informs us that S. Paul was recognized as being the equal of the Twelve and shared their labours, whereas S. Paul states definitely that he stayed with S. Peter for a fortnight, and saw no other Apostle but S. James the Lord's brother. Presumably S. Luke has no very definite information as to the details of the visit, which would seem to have lasted for some weeks (see below, n. 50), and assumes that S. Paul would naturally meet the Twelve since he was recognized as being more or less their equal. There is no reason for doubting S. Luke's statement that he was recognized in this way, or that the part played by S. Barnabas on this occasion and the incidents which led to S. Paul's departure are accurately recorded. He is mistaken in his implied statement that S. Paul was associated with the Twelve. For the reason for the absence of the Twelve cf. c. III. § ii. n. 20.

47. This was certainly the case, so far as the Twelve were concerned (Acts iv. 13). The Hellenist leaders had been dispersed, and it is impossible to say how far they were in any way the equals of S. Stephen. Even if there were any among the Pharisee converts who had any claim to learning, S. Paul could claim to be their superior (Gal. i. 14).

48. Cf. c. I. nn. 41, 45 and c. III. § ii. nn. 35 *seqq.* The reasons which marked out S. James the Lord's brother as a leader in Jerusalem would tell even more strongly in favour of S. Paul.

49. Cf. above, c. I. n. 37 and Appendix on the Apostolate. For S. Paul's view of his own position cf. Gal. i. 1 and 15. S. Paul uses the word "Apostle" loosely to cover all those who were regarded as of more or less Apostolic rank, but he has no doubts that he is as good an Apostle as any (2 Cor. xi. 5 and xii. 11, and cf. below, c. VII. § iii. n. 10).

50. Gal. i. 18. S. Paul gives no evidence as to whether the fifteen days ended on account of his own departure from Jerusalem or on account of S. Peter's. On the other hand it is unlikely that S. Paul should only have intended to stay for a fortnight, and almost impossible that in so brief a period, a considerable part of which

was spent in convincing the Church of the genuineness of his conversion, he should have aroused such violent opposition as to make it necessary for him to leave the city in fear of his life (Acts ix. 29 is here confirmed by xxii. 17). The inference is that S. Peter left Jerusalem before S. Paul. S. Paul's own visit cannot have been a long one. It certainly would not cover any of the great Jewish festivals when he could hardly fail to meet some of the Twelve. Probably it covered two or three months.

51. c. II. nn. 2 and 6. From the fact that no controversy as to the question of circumcision was raised at the time of S. Paul's first visit, and that S. Stephen's teaching excited no opposition within the Church, it seems plain that the Hellenist synagogues were so isolated that teaching given in them passed unnoticed in Hebrew circles. It is therefore only natural to suppose that normally the Hellenist synagogues would not be much affected by the preaching of Christianity among the Hebrews. It must be remembered that the original Hellenists had been dispersed and that the Twelve were at this period not normally resident in the city. Their absence tended to leave the Church more in the hands of the Hebrew Christians, and it thus would naturally become a more exclusively Hebrew body (cf. c. III. § ii. n. 20).

These facts confirm the general accuracy, though not the details, of S. Luke's narrative of the day of Pentecost. It is very difficult to see how a purely Hebrew movement could have succeeded in attracting a large number of Hellenist adherents, unless it had been brought to their notice by some catastrophic outburst of enthusiasm at a time when the city was filled with visitors from the Dispersion. Apart from some such incident the Hellenist converts could hardly have attained to any considerable numerical strength. (For the details of the Pentecost narrative cf. Appendix to c. I.)

52. Acts xxii. 19.

53. See c. II. nn. 10 and 24 *seqq*. It is only natural to suppose that S. Paul might hope that his own far less radical view might succeed, in spite of the rejection of S. Stephen's doctrines.

54. It is clear that S. Paul continued throughout his life to practise Judaism, and that he expected Jewish converts to do so. Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 18, Acts xvi. 3, xxi. 26, xxiii. 6, where it is incredible that S. Paul should have been guilty of the dishonesty of proclaiming himself a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee, if his only claim to the title was that he believed in the Resurrection of the dead; for this belief was widely held by Jews who had no claim to be regarded as Pharisees. The only objection that can be brought against this view is the language of 1 Cor. ix. 21, where S. Paul seems to imply that when dealing with Gentiles he behaved as if not bound by the Law. On the other hand this interpretation of the passage is impossible. S. Paul could not both behave as a Jew when dealing with Jews and as free from the Law when dealing with Gentiles, since apart from the moral dishonesty of pretending to observe the Law when in Jewish society and neglecting it in Gentile society, it would be impossible for him to conceal from Jews whom he hoped to convert the fact that he disregarded the Law when not in Jewish company. Obviously no Jew would be in the smallest degree influenced by the fact that he observed the Law when it suited his purpose to do so; obedience to the Law was a lifelong matter. Apparently S. Paul here means that in dealing with those outside the Law, he behaves as if he were free from the Law (as indeed he claims to be in *v.* 20), not in the sense of refusing to recognize any divine Law, but as in fact obeying the Jewish Law in Christ, or in a Christian sense, as something which he is more or less bound to observe, but which others are not. The rhetorical tone of the passage obscures the facts.

S. Paul is not entirely consistent with his own teaching, since he here denies that he is bound to keep the Law, whereas in vii. 18 he regards obedience to it as a duty. Similarly in Acts xxi. 21 *seqq*. he is represented both as keeping it himself and as not teaching Jews to abandon it. It is, however, not surprising that his language is inconsistent. He was clear that it was necessary for Jewish Christians to continue to obey the Law; whether this was merely a matter of expediency, or a matter of principle, he would hardly trouble to consider.

It must be noticed that on his own principles, if he obeyed the Law at all, he

was bound to obey it as a Pharisee (Gal. ii. 14, vi. 13, cf. c. I. n. 46, and below, c. V. § iv. n. 5). Anything less was really worthless.

55. S. Paul always regards his commission as being to preach to the Gentiles (Gal. i. 16, Acts ix. 15, xxvi. 17). It appears that his original plan, after leaving Damascus, was to work among the Hellenists at Jerusalem, through them to influence the Jews of the Dispersion, and thus ultimately to permeate the Gentile world. In any case he was bound to reach the Gentiles through the synagogues of the Dispersion; and he could influence a far wider area by converting the Hellenists at Jerusalem than by journeys throughout the world, since the Hellenists would retain various connections with all parts of the Dispersion, and could in many cases return to their native lands to convert their brethren. Further, on the occasions of the festivals of the Jewish religion, he could hope to affect the vast multitudes of pilgrims who came up to the city (cf. Philo, *De Mon.* ii. 1 (M. II. 223), *Antt.* XVII. ix. 3, *B.J.* II. xiv. 3). In these respects Jerusalem might well seem an ideal centre and it is thus possible to understand how S. Paul, while apparently regarding himself as the Apostle of the Gentiles from the time of his conversion, should yet endeavour to preach at Jerusalem after his departure from Damascus.

56. The sense of superiority to the Gentiles, which was the natural result of the Jewish claim to be the Chosen People of God, was one of the main obstacles to S. Paul's preaching throughout. His answer to it occupies the whole of Ro. i. 18–iii. 20, which is devoted to an attempt to prove that the claim that the Gentiles have a right to the Gospel without the Law does not imply any denial of the Jewish claim to be the Chosen People (cf. above, n. 28). His practice of preaching to the Jews first, wherever he went, was in fact an admission that they had a claim to priority. Cf. Acts xiii. 41, which is probably modelled on genuine reminiscences of S. Paul's methods of opening his teaching in the synagogues of the Dispersion, where the Jews are only warned of the danger of rejecting the Gospel; the meaning of the warning is made plain by xiii. 46. Cf. also S. Paul's allusion to this desire for a recognition of the superiority of the Jew in Gal. iv. 17, vi. 13.

This national sense of superiority to the Gentiles might naturally express itself in a variety of arguments, a fact which would make it none the easier to meet, since, even though the argument was answered, the feeling would remain.

57. See above, c. I. nn. 49, 53. S. Paul's main answer to this objection is that in fact the Law cannot produce righteousness (see n. 25). His contention is reinforced in Ro. ii. 17 by the *ad hominem* argument, based on the scandals which were only too painfully familiar to the Jews of the Dispersion (cf. c. I. n. 50). The Jew might indeed argue that the guilty persons were in fact apostates from Judaism; on the other hand S. Paul could reply that the fact of their apostasy proved the worthlessness of the Law, which ought to have prevented them from apostatizing. The weakness of his position lay in the fact that it did not allow for similar failures among Christians (cf. n. 31 and c. VII. § iii. n. 3). Naturally we have no means of knowing the exact arguments which roused the opposition of the Hellenists on this occasion; but it may fairly be presumed that the nature of their objections to S. Paul's teaching was similar to that of the Jewish Christians at Rome to whom S. Paul writes.

58. Cf. c. I. n. 46. S. Peter, as a Galilean Jew, who only lived up to the popular standards of Judaism (Acts x. 14, 28, and xv. 10, and see further, c. V. § iv. n. 5), would in normal circumstances hesitate to oppose in a question of the interpretation of the Law and the O.T. a man who could from the Pharisaic standpoint accuse him of living no better than the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 14). It seems safe to presume that on the occasion of this visit S. Peter, as on other occasions, yielded to the stronger influence and raised no objections to S. Paul's attitude.

59. Cf. above, n. 54. The explanation given in the text appears to give the reasons for the failure of the Hebrew Christians to oppose S. Paul until after the admission of Cornelius. They appear not to have heard his actual views, and in any case they would not be thoroughly aroused to their full implications unless they were faced with the concrete fact of an unbaptized Gentile with whom they might at any moment be asked to eat.

60. *Antt.* XVIII. vi. 10. Of Maryllus nothing is known, but it may be presumed that he would not have sanctioned persecution on religious grounds in view of the

general attitude of the Roman procurators of Judaea. He would certainly not have done so except at the urgent demand of the Sanhedrin.

61. The same reasons which protected S. James the Lord's brother would tell even more strongly in favour of S. Paul as a more prominent member of the party. Similarly he could hope far more from his fellow-Pharisees at this period than on the occasion of his last visit, when they might well have been alienated by his notoriety as the Apostle of the Gentiles. None the less even on that occasion Pharisaical solidarity was strong enough to prevent the condemnation of a Pharisee by the Sadducees (cf. c. VIII. § ii. n. 13).

This appears to be the reason for the failure of the Hellenists to use against S. Paul the methods which had proved effective against S. Stephen. The words ἐπεχείρουν ἀνελεῖν obviously imply an attempt at assassination.

62. Ramsay's view that the vision referred to in Acts xxii. 18 occurred on the occasion of a later visit cannot be upheld. In the first place S. Paul clearly places it on the occasion of his first return to Jerusalem, while in the second it agrees exactly with the position as described in Acts ix. 29. S. Paul is aware of the fact that he is in danger, but is none the less anxious to remain in order to testify to the faith in a way in which he alone, as the murderer of S. Stephen, is able to do. This anxiety to remain is natural at the outset of his career, when Jerusalem would seem the natural and inevitable place for his ministry; it is hardly probable that he would feel the same anxiety when he was already committed to heavy obligations at Tarsus and Antioch. Further it is misreading the whole of S. Paul's career and outlook on his task to suppose that he begins his activity as the Apostle of the Gentiles with his "missionary journeys." He is already known to S. Barnabas as the natural person to assist in the work of supervising a partly Gentile community in Acts xi. 25. In point of fact he is already the Apostle of the Gentiles when he addresses the Hellenists; the only change in his conception of the duties of his office lies in the fact that it is exercised among the Gentiles, *i.e.* in the Dispersion. The vision is the answer given in an apparently external form of his own mental conflict on the question whether it is his duty to go or to stay.

It is true that in this particular speech S. Paul seems to date the beginning of his work among the Gentiles from this vision, not from his conversion as in ix. 15 and xxvi. 17. The discrepancy is however natural, since on this occasion S. Paul could hardly fail to realize that his speech was not likely to last beyond the first mention of the Gentiles, and would naturally avoid mentioning them as long as possible.

For the probable duration of his visit cf. n. 50.

For the nature of S. Paul's work between his departure from Jerusalem and the "first missionary journey" see below. There is no evidence that it was not work among the Gentiles in exactly the same sense as his work during the journeys recorded in the Acts.

63. The approval of the Church is apparently implied in the use of the somewhat formal word ἐξαποστέλλω (cf. Acts xi. 22, xiii. 26, xxii. 21, Gal. iv. 4, 6, and the examples in *Voc. Gr. Test.* iii. 222). (For its use in xvii. 14 see below, c. VI. § v. n. 14.) It would seem that S. Paul had some definite authority from the Church of Jerusalem to preach in the synagogues of Tarsus, though it is possible that many of those who agreed to the proposal did not realize exactly the form in which he would interpret either the authority given him or the doctrines of Christianity.

64. Acts xxi. 39 (cf. n. 2 above). Although S. Paul had spent little of his life at Tarsus, it is to be presumed that the family had connections there. In any case his reputation as a Jew of high standing and a citizen of the town would give him a certain claim to consideration in the local synagogues.

65. For the Jews at Tarsus see *G.J.V.* III. 22.

66. Strabo, XIV. v. 13, mentions it as a characteristic of Tarsus that most of those who learnt philosophy there were natives, but that they usually went abroad and lived elsewhere, seldom returning home. He declares it to be a more highly-educated city than Athens or Alexandria. Obviously such a place would suit S. Paul very well as a centre for his propaganda. The conventional Jewish apologetic system could naturally be employed with as much success at Tarsus as at Alexandria. For a general account of the city see Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* IV. 685. I cannot

however accept his view that the atmosphere of Tarsus influenced S. Paul's early education to any considerable extent.

67. For the tendency to laxity among the Jews of the Dispersion see c. 1. n. 50. In general no doubt the Jews of Tarsus would be as devout and obscurantist as any other body of Jews, but clearly the general level of zeal for the Law would be less than among the Hellenists of Jerusalem.

68. It is obvious that S. Luke cannot intend his readers to suppose that the arrival of the refugees from Jerusalem at Antioch did not take place until the point reached in his narrative at Acts xi. 19. It is indeed probable that many of the first evangelists of the city went there direct without preaching on their way. S. Luke expressly mentions that they included certain Cypriot and Cyrenean Jews. The fact is significant, since Antioch was the natural place for them to withdraw to, if they intended to return to their own homes by sea. Seleucia, the port of Antioch, would be an easier place in which to find a ship than Caesarea. Some of the Cypriots actually reached Cyprus, but it seems likely that the greater part of them after an initial success at Antioch decided to stay there. This is clearly so in the case of Lucius of Cyrene in Acts xiii. 1.

Thus they could not take a period of some two years to reach Antioch, and it follows that the foundation of the Church in the city was known in Jerusalem at the time of S. Paul's departure, though not the position of the Gentile converts. Hence it is probable that one of S. Paul's reasons for going to Tarsus was that he knew it to be the next point of importance to be evangelized.

APPENDIX I

S. PAUL AND HELLENISTIC JUDAISM

It must be borne in mind that S. Paul's youth was on his own showing passed in Jerusalem and that his education was primarily Jewish (Acts xxii. 3, cf. Gal. i. 14, Phil. iii. 5). None the less his family had very strong Hellenistic associations, since he was a citizen by birth of Rome and Tarsus. In any case Hellenism had penetrated deeply into Palestinian Judaism, and Jews of purely Palestinian origin were often more Hellenized than many Jews of the Dispersion. In general, however, a Hellenistic origin would, in the case of an educated Jew, imply an outlook similar to that of the Hellenistic Jewish writers. For a general survey of the whole field of Hellenistic Jewish literature cf. *G.J.V.* III. 420 *seqq.*, and for the literature with which we are here particularly concerned 503 *seqq.*, and the accounts of the books mentioned. A survey of the whole field is given by Drummond in *Philo Judaeus*, and more briefly by Oesterley in *The Books of the Apocrypha*. For Wisdom and the Pseudo-Aristeas cf. also the introductions and notes on these writings in *Apocr. and Pseud.* and the editions of Wisdom.

It is necessary to remember that we possess only a small amount of the literature of the Judaism of the Dispersion, and that it was composed at an age when plagiarism without acknowledgment was not regarded as a literary crime. Consequently it is never possible to be certain how far a similarity of ideas and even language may not be due to the fact that two writers are borrowing from a common source. Further, since all Jewish writers appeal in the last resort to the O.T. and use it in accordance with a more or less conventional system of interpretation, it is manifest that there are always wide possibilities of the occurrence of striking similarities which have no further relation to one another than a common use of the same passage of the O.T.

The three classes of writings distinguished in the text differ rather in degree than in kind. In each case the Law and the history of Israel are portrayed as a direct revelation of God, which expresses the fulness of the truths guessed at by Gentile philosophy. The literal truth of the narrative and the literal interpretation of the Law are never disputed, but they are only of secondary importance. There is indeed a distinction between the typological use of history by the author of Wisdom in which the lessons drawn from the incidents of the past are used to point the same moral for the present, and the more strictly allegorical method of the Pseudo-Aristeas and Philo in which the incidents of the past or the literal enactments of the Law are made to bear a secondary meaning entirely remote from the original significance. In both cases, however, the spiritual meaning is the most important one to the writer.

Although it is a matter of considerable difficulty to fix the exact date of some of the writings of this class, it seems natural to suppose that the earliest attempts would take the form of allegorizing those elements in the ordinary life and religion of the Jew which would be the first to excite the curiosity and in some cases the opposition of the Gentile (cf. c. 1. n. 53). A specimen of this obvious type of allegory is the section of *Ps. Arist.* which explains the difference between clean and unclean meats (144 *seqq.*). The date of this particular passage is uncertain; and in any case the necessity for this method of explaining away the Law was bound to last as long as the Jew was encumbered with the task of justifying to the Gentile the literal observance of the Law, and its minute prescriptions as to his conduct. Cf. Philo, *De Vict. Off.* 1 (M. II. 251), for an attempt which is similar in spirit to explain the regulation that victims offered as sacrifices must be without blemish. S. Paul's familiarity with this method of explaining away the details of the Law by the introduction of a moral allegory emerges in 1 Cor. ix. 9.

A specimen of his use of the typological method of applying the history of Israel to the events of his own time is found in 1 Cor. x. 1–13. Here, apart from the rabbinical detail of the moving rock and the introduction of Christian ideas, notably the use of the passage of the Red Sea as a type of baptism, S. Paul's method is precisely that of the author of Wisdom, the summary of the misdeeds of the Israelites being taken as a typical warning against presumptuousness. The object of the book of Wisdom is to prove that the Jewish religion is the supreme revelation of divine "wisdom." "Wisdom" however is not an attribute of God, represented as an independent personality for artistic purposes, as is the case in the early chapters of the Proverbs. The writer has indeed borrowed the idea of personifying wisdom from the older Jewish literature in order to ensure the continuity of his teaching with traditional Jewish ideas; but wisdom or the Spirit of God has become in fact a principle possessing almost an independent personal existence, and is the agent or agency through which God created and preserves the universe. The Law is the expression of wisdom as applied to human conduct; so that by observing the Law man is able to correspond to the purpose of his creation and to attain to a glorious immortality. Wisdom is in fact the λόγος of the Stoics, under a Jewish name; while the Stoic conception of the divine nature is made to appear in the history of Israel. (The later section from the beginning of c. xi is from another hand and is intended to show how the justice of God uses the instruments of men's sins as the means of their punishment; it is far more Jewish in character, and very inferior in thought. For a general discussion of the teaching of the two parts of the book and their relation to one another see the literature referred to above.) For the present purpose

it is of less importance to decide how far S. Paul actually used the book than to note the extent to which both of them make use of similar methods for adapting in the one case Judaism, in the other case Christianity, to the outlook of the Gentile world or to Jewish circles influenced by Gentile ideas and familiarity with the same stream of hellenized Jewish thought. It is in fact almost impossible to doubt that there is a direct literary relation between S. Paul and Wisdom; but whether in any particular case there has been a direct borrowing by S. Paul is immaterial as compared with the fact that he was undoubtedly familiar with the methods and conventions of Alexandrine thought which find their expression in Wisdom. From this point of view the following passages are of importance.

Wisd. ii. 23. Cf. elsewhere *passim* for the substitution in Wisdom of the conception of personal incorruption ἀφθαρσία or immortality ἀθανασία (so in iii. 4, iv. 1) for the more general belief in a resurrection of the material body, which was characteristic of Judaism. The author retains a conventional Jewish eschatology as to a future judgment of all souls at the establishment of a Messianic kingdom, but his clear belief is in immortality after death. S. Paul is faced with the same problem in 1 Cor. xv, where he has to commend the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection of the body, which has already been taught to the Corinthians. The teaching was naturally taken by them to mean the resurrection of the body in a purely material sense, as in fact it was understood in Judaism. He does so in the same way as the author of Wisdom, by substituting immortality coupled with a glorified and non-material body for the older view. Like the author of Wisdom (iii. 7 *seqq.*) he retains a conventional Jewish conception of the final judgment, which is not entirely easy to harmonize with his teaching of immortality. The important point to notice is that both writers are faced with the same difficulty of harmonizing Jewish eschatology with Greek thought, and there is a remarkable similarity in the methods which they employ for the purpose.

Wisd. v. 17 *seqq.* For the perhaps decisive resemblance between the adaptation by the author here of Is. lix. 17 and its adaptation by S. Paul in Eph. vi. 11 see *Apocr. and Pseud.* i. 527. The passage is of course only of importance as very strong evidence that S. Paul knew the book of Wisdom; the imagery is simply an extension of that of Isaiah.

Wisd. ix. 15. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 4. In both these passages the language used in fact implies an acceptance of the inherent evil of matter. Neither S. Paul nor the author of Wisdom would of course commit himself to the implications which that doctrine involves; but both incorporate an idea common in the philosophy of the time. (For the probability that Wisdom has borrowed direct from the *Phaedo* cf. *Apocr. and Pseud.* i. 532.) The doctrine affords at first sight a satisfactory explanation of the stage of religious experience described in Ro. vii. 5 *seqq.*, where it is also implied. In the latter passage indeed S. Paul avoids the implication that matter is necessarily evil, since he is discussing the state of fallen and unredeemed humanity; but in 2 Cor. v we are dealing with the Christian. The same conception is common in Philo, cf. *De Gigant.* 7 (M. i. 267); see Appendix II.

Wisd. ix. 17 (cf. *v.* 13). Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 11, 16. This is a passage of the utmost importance as showing S. Paul's indebtedness to Alexandrine thought. It is impossible to be certain that S. Paul borrows direct from Wisdom, since both may be working independently from Prov. xx. 27, as expanded by a general convention of Hellenistic Judaism; while S. Paul's thought is possibly influenced by non-Jewish sources (see Appendix II). In Wisdom the Spirit of God is equivalent to wisdom, and thus becomes the Stoic λόγος, under a name which ensures the continuity of the conception with traditional Jewish ideas. In S. Paul the Spirit of God has assumed a more independent and personal character similar to that of the divine πνεῦμα of Oriental speculation, and is the agency by which the Christian is able to understand the true wisdom of God as revealed in the redemption of man. Wisdom

has receded into a mere attribute of God, and her place has been taken by the Holy Ghost, which is now a power by which man is brought into direct personal relation with God.

Wisd. xii. 12, 20 (cf. also xv. 7). Cf. Ro. ix. 20. Here the resemblance of the attempt to justify God in rejecting the many for the sake of saving the few seems hard to explain except on the supposition either that S. Paul is borrowing direct from Wisdom, or that both are drawing upon an argument which was a more or less recognized commonplace of the time. On the side of the latter supposition it may be observed that a similar attempt to justify God is found in 4 Esdr. vii. 52. This is a case in which we can see the extent to which Jewish thought even in Palestine had been influenced by alien conceptions (cf. above, n. 9), and although there is little resemblance between the language of 4 Esdr. and that of S. Paul or Wisdom, the recurrence of the problem suggests both that it was one often discussed, and that the not very satisfactory answer was more or less conventional.

xiv. 12, 22 *seqq.* Cf. Ro. i. 24 for the thought that the sins of the Gentiles are the result of their idolatry. The whole passage in Romans is instructive since in it S. Paul argues that the unnatural conduct of the Gentiles in substituting idols for the one true God, Whom they ought to have known, finds its punishment in the unnatural vices to which they have surrendered themselves. This argument has an obvious resemblance to that of the later section of Wisdom, the object of which is to prove that δι' ὧν τὶς ἁμαρτάνει, διὰ τούτων κολάζεται.

On the other hand, while the author of this part of Wisdom conceives of this principle in a thoroughly crude and mechanical form (if, *e.g.* the heathen worship beasts, a plague of the most worthless kind of beasts is sent to punish them), S. Paul puts forward the far higher conception that a false view of God inevitably leads to a false standard of conduct, which is the natural punishment of the original error.

There is, however, a genuine resemblance of thought between the preceding argument of S. Paul that the Gentiles ought to have known God from His works and Wisd. xiii. 1. Here both writers are clearly utilizing the same thought in order to prove that the heathen are morally responsible for their idolatry since they might have inferred the true nature of God. It is instructive to compare this idea with the rabbinical attempt to justify God for rejecting the heathen by the legend that the Law was in the first instance promulgated to all nations but rejected by all but Israel (2 Bar. xv. 5, 6, xix. 3, xlviii. 40, 4 Esdr. vii. 72).

For the attempt to find in S. Paul the distinction drawn in Wisdom between different types of idolatry of varying degrees of error see n. 13, and for the lists of vices which appear in S. Paul's Epistles and in Wisd. xiv. 25 *seqq.*, as well as in other Jewish and early Christian literature, cf. c. 1. n. 49. These lists are almost a commonplace and the list of Wisdom shows no particularly close resemblance to those of S. Paul.

A far more obscure question is the relation, if any, between S. Paul and Philo. It would be difficult to find two writers who have so much in common and yet are so totally unlike in their whole outlook. Both are engaged in attempting to convert the Gentile world on the basis of the Jewish Scriptures, and both make use of the same typological and allegorical methods. Both display the same absolute disregard of the original meaning and context of the passages which they select to give authority to their doctrines. Naturally, in view of the dissimilarity of their ultimate objectives, we find that there is the utmost dissimilarity in the doctrines which they seek to prove, and this dissimilarity is enhanced by the difference in their whole outlook on religion as such. S. Paul's object is to find in the O.T. types and allegories which will justify his contention that the

Christian revelation, interpreted in the light of his own view of its theological implications, is the fulfilment of Judaism. Judaism itself was true so far as it went, but has now been superseded by a fuller knowledge of the truth. Philo's object is to prove that the Jewish religion is the one true revelation of God, which anticipates and ratifies all that is best in the philosophy of the world. Cf. *Leg. Alleg.* i. 33 (M. i. 65); *Q.R.D.H.* 43 (M. i. 503). S. Paul's view of Judaism is, however, widely different from Philo's. It is essentially the Palestinian Judaism of his time, affected by Hellenistic thought, and aware of the necessity of explaining away much that might seem difficult in the O.T., but a genuine development from the earlier stages of the national faith. Thus, apart from the revelation given in the person of Our Lord, God is to S. Paul a vividly personal being whose love and anger need neither explanation nor apology. He is surrounded by hosts of angelic ministers, at constant war with Satan and the angels of evil who attend him, and He will one day appear in visible glory to judge all men according to their works through the Anointed Servant Whom He has fore-ordained to work the redemption of His people. (In this respect of course S. Paul's beliefs have been coloured by Christianity, but it is easy to see the conventional Jewish eschatology that lies behind his expectation of the Second Coming.) Philo, on the other hand, is primarily a Greek philosopher, whose God resembles the formless Absolute of later philosophy far more than the Jahweh of the O.T. He is indeed attended by angels, but these are divine λόγοι as impersonal and formless as Himself. The idea of evil spirits is almost completely allegorized away (cf *De Gigant.* 3 (M. i. 264), where they are the pre-existing souls of the wicked), and the Messianic hope is no more than a belief that one day the whole nation will return to the true worship of God, and will be restored in triumphant prosperity to its own land. Even in retaining so much Philo is inconsistent with himself, for it is impossible not to feel that in the Messianic passage in *De Execr.* 8, 9 (M. ii. 435) he has allowed himself to put his national ideals before his philosophy. Even the mystical apprehension of God, which both of them describe, is totally different. To S. Paul it consists in the vision of Our Lord in glory, surrounded by the traditional imagery of later Judaism; to Philo it is a state of philosophical contemplation of a more or less abstract perfection.

Apart from this difference of outlook and purpose the resemblances between the two writers are remarkable. In part no doubt they are due to the fact that both use the O.T. and employ the same methods of rabbinical exposition and Hellenistic allegorizing. None the less it is difficult to believe that they are due to mere coincidence. This will be clear from the following passages.

Ro. ii. 14. οὗτοι...ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος. Cf. *De Abr.* i (M. ii. 2), *De Vit. Moys.* i. 28 (M. ii. 106), *De Decal.* i (M. ii. 180).

Ro. iv. 3 and Gal. iii. 6. The quotation of Gen. xv. 6, used to prove that the righteousness of Abraham depended on his faith, appears in *Q.R.D.H.* 18, 19 (M. I. 486), *De Mut. Nom.* 35 (M. I. 606), *De Migr. Abr.* 9 (M. I. 442, 3), *De Abr.* 46 (M. II. 39).

Ro. vii. 7. Cf. *De Jud.* 5 (M. II. 348) and *De Concup. passim* for οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις as a summary of the Law.

Ro. viii. 5. (Cf. Gal. v. 16 and elsewhere in the Pauline writings for the contrast between σάρξ and πνεῦμα.) This is of course typical of Alexandrine thought and the idea is common in Philo. Cf. esp. *Q.R.D.H.* 12 (M. I. 481), ὥστε διττὸν εἶναι γένος ἀνθρώπων, τὸ μὲν θείῳ πνεύματι καὶ λογισμῷ βιούντων, τὸ δὲ αἵματι καὶ σαρκὸς ἡδονῇ ζώντων, *De Gigant.* 7 (M. I. 267).

Ro. viii. 16 *seqq.* Cf. *Q.R.D.H.* 13 (M. I. 482), (ζητεῖ) εἰ δύναταί τις ἐφιέμενος τῆς ἐναίμου ζώης καὶ μεταποιούμενος ἔτι τῶν κατ' αἴσθησιν γένεσθαι τῶν ἀσωμάτων καὶ θείων πραγμάτων κληρονόμος. τούτων ἀξιοῦται μόνος ὁ καταπνευσθεὶς ἄνωθεν οὐρανίου τε καὶ θείας μοίρας ἐπιλαχὼν ὁ καθαρώτατος νοῦς.

Ro. ix. 7 *seqq.* (cf. Gal. iii. 16). Cf. *De Mut. Nom.* 26 (M. I. 600), where the fact that only one son is promised to Sarah is made to prove the doctrine that there is only one form of good, whereas evil is manifold.

Ro. ix. 10 *seqq.* Cf. *Leg. Alleg.* iii. 29 (M. I. 105), for an explanation of the fact that God could prefer Jacob to Esau before either of them were born.

It is striking to notice that the choice of Isaac alone of the children of Abraham and the preference of Jacob to Esau, used here by S. Paul, are combined by Philo in *De Nobil.* 4 (M. II. 441), the object being in the case of Philo to prove that nobility of birth is useless without virtue.

Ro. x. 6 *seqq.* Cf. *De Post. Cain.* 24 (M. I. 241) for καλεῖ δὲ (Μωϋσῆς) πλησίον καὶ ἐγγὺς τὸ ἀγαθόν. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἀπιέναι, φησίν, εἰς οὐρανὸν οὐδὲ πέραν θαλάττης ἀφίκεσθαι δεῖ κατὰ ζήτησιν τοῦ καλοῦ, ἐγγὺς γὰρ καὶ πλησίον ἵστασθαι ἑκάστῳ...ἐν γὰρ τῷ στόματί σου, φησίν, ἐστὶν καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν, τοῦτο δὲ ἐν λόγοις, ἐν βουλαῖς καὶ ἐν πράξεσι. Cf. *De Poenit.* 2 (M. II. 406).

Ro. xi. 7, 8. Cf. *De Prof.* 22 (M. I. 564), where the contrast between those who seek without finding and those who find without seeking is closely associated, as it is by S. Paul with the not very relevant quotation from Deut. xxix. 3.

1 Cor. ii. 11. Cf. *Leg. Alleg.* i. 13 (M. I. 51) for the view (also found in Wisdom, cf. above) that man can only know God in virtue of divine inspiration (ἐνέπνευσε).

1 Cor. iii. 2. Cf. *De Agr.* 2 (M. I. 301), *De Migr. Abr.* 6 (M. I. 440). This metaphor of milk and strong meat is however obvious and might easily be due to chance, or a reminiscence of Is. xxviii. 9.

1 Cor. vi. 16 (Eph. v. 31). Cf. *Leg. Alleg.* ii. 14 (M. I. 75), ὁ νοῦς ὅταν (τῇ αἰσθήσει) δουλωθῇ, καταλίπῃ καὶ τὸν πατέρα, τὸν ὅλων θεὸν καὶ τὴν μητέρα τῶν συμπάντων, τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ σοφίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ προσκολλᾶται καὶ ἑνοῦται τῇ αἰσθήσει, καὶ ἀναλύεται εἰς αἴσθησιν, ἵνα γίνωνται μία σὰρξ καὶ ἓν πάθος οἱ δύο...ὅταν δὲ τὸ χεῖρον ἡ αἴσθησις ἀκολουθήσῃ τῷ κρείττονι τῷ νῷ, οὐκέτι ἔσται σὰρξ ἀλλ' ἀμφότερα νοῦς. (In the latter of the two passages referred to S. Paul alludes to a mystical interpretation of Gen. ii. 23, 24 as symbolizing the union of the Church with Our Lord analogous to that which he gives in the former.)

1 Cor. vii. 18–23 and 31. Cf. *De Jos.* 24 (M. II. 61), ἀλλότριον τοῦτο· μὴ ἐπιθύμει, ἴδιον τοῦτο, χρῶ μὴ παραχρώμενος. περιουσιάζεις; μεταδίδου...ὀλίγα κέκτησαι; μὴ φθόνει τοῖς ἔχουσι...εὐδοξεῖς καὶ τετίμησαι; μὴ καταλαζονεύου. ταπεινὸς εἶ ταῖς τύχαις; ἀλλὰ τὸ φρόνημα μὴ καταπιπτέτω. Here the whole resemblance of the style and the similarity of χρῶ μὴ παραχρώμενος to S. Paul's οἱ χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι is striking.

1 Cor. x. 1–4. Here S. Paul introduces a whole string of allegorical allusions, which, as they stand, are almost unintelligible on account of their brevity. The same incidents in the history of the Exodus are allegorized by Philo. The separation of the Israelites from the Egyptians by the cloud and their passage of the Red Sea is made by S. Paul a type of baptism. (The cloud is presumably typical of the Holy Ghost, the Red Sea of the water of baptism.) For the cloud cf. *Q.R.D.H.* 42 (M. I. 501), ὑπὸ γὰρ τοῦ φιλοπαθοῦς καὶ ἀθέου τὸ ἐγκρατὲς καὶ θεοφιλὲς γένος οὐκ ἔτι εἴασε διώκεσθαι τὸ σκεπαστήριον καὶ σωτήριον τῶν φίλων ἀμυντήριον δὲ καὶ κολαστήριον τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὅπλον ἡ νεφέλη...τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ

δωρεὰν ἐξαίρετον ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας πατὴρ ἵνα μεθόριος στὰς τὸ γενόμενον διακρίνῃ τοῦ πεποιηκότος· ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μέν ἐστι τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον πρεσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον. (For the description of the λόγος as ἀρχάγγελος cf. *De Somn.* 25 (M. I. 644), where God Himself is described as ἀρχάγγελος.) For the passage of the Red Sea, which is in Philo a conventional allegory for the escape from the evil (or material) to the good (or spiritual) cf. *De Sacr. Ab. et Cain.* 17 (M. I. 174), διάβασις γὰρ ἐπὶ θεὸν τοῦ γεννητοῦ καὶ φθαρτοῦ τὸ πάσχα καλεῖται. Cf. *ib.* 39 (M. I. 190), *De Sept.* 18 (M. II. 292), ψυχῆς κάθαρσιν αἰνίττεται τὰ διαβατήρια. Manna as spiritual food (in 1 Cor. ix. 3 presumably the Eucharist) is again a conventional allegory in Philo for the λόγος or its influence on the human soul, cf. *Leg. Alleg.* iii. 59–61 (M. I. 120 *seqq.*), *De Prof.* 25 (M. I. 566). For the spiritual drink cf. *Leg. Alleg.* ii. 21 (M. I. 82), ἡ γὰρ ἀκρότομος πέτρα ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν, ἣν ἄκραν καὶ πρωτίστην ἔτεμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεων ἐξ ἧς ποτίζει τὰς φιλοθέους ψυχάς.

For 1 Cor. xv. 45 see below.

2 Cor. v. 1 *seqq.*, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 53. Cf. *De Carit.* 4 (M. II. 387), ἤρξατο μεταβάλλειν ἐκ θνητῆς ζωῆς εἰς ἀθάνατον βίον καὶ...συνησθάνετο τῶν ἐξ ὧν συνεκέκρατο διαζεύξεως, τοῦ μὲν σώματος ὀστέου δίκην περιαιρουμένου, τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς ἀπογυμνουμένης καὶ τὴν κατὰ ψυχὴν ποθούσης ἔνθενδε μετάστασιν.

2 Cor. vi. 16. Cf. *De Somn.* ii. 37 (M. I. 691), πόλιν δὲ Θεοῦ...καλεῖ...τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ σοφοῦ, ᾗ λέγεται καὶ ἐμπεριπατεῖν ὁ Θεός, ὡς ἐν πόλει. περιπατήσω γάρ, φησίν, ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἔσομαι ἐν ὑμῖν θεός. Cf. also *ib.* i. 23 (M. II. 643). S. Paul has special reasons here for describing the soul as the temple of God (see below, c. VII. § i. n. 4). The use of the quotation from Lev. xxvi. 12 of the soul of the individual both by S. Paul and Philo is striking, since it is highly artificial.

2 Cor. viii. 15. Cf. *Q.R.D.H.* 39 (M. I. 500). S. Paul quotes Exod. xvi. 18 to stimulate the liberality of the Corinthians; it is worth noting that the quotation in Philo is closely connected with a quotation of Exod. xxx. 15, the authority for the collection of the Temple half-shekel, an institution very much in S. Paul's mind at the time when he wrote. (See below, c. VII. § i. n. 4.)

2 Cor. viii. 21. Cf. *De Ebr.* 20 (M. I. 369). The quotation by both of Prov. iii. 4 is of interest, in view of the rarity of quotations from this book in both authors.

2 Cor. xi. 3. Cf. *Leg. Alleg.* ii. 18 (M. I. 79). Perhaps this is worth noting from the fact that the serpent in Philo stands for pleasure which is πολύπλοκος καὶ ποικιλή, a contrast to the Pauline ἁπλότης ἡ εἰς Χριστόν; but here we are dealing with a favourite theme for rabbinical enlargement, cf. n. 14 above.

Gal. iii. 13. Cf. *De Post. Cain.* 8, 17 (M. I. 231, 236). S. Paul and Philo both quote Deut. xxi. 23. S. Paul, however, merely seems to use the text to prove that Our Lord by bearing the death of the cross, to which a peculiar curse was attached, has redeemed man from the curse imposed on all who do not keep the Law; there is no trace of any allegorical significance as in Philo, who regards "hanging on a tree" as meaning "clinging to matter," and not to God.

Gal. iv. 22 *seqq.* Cf. *De Mut. Nom.* 25 (M. I. 599), where the children of the soul that is barren as regards evil (symbolized by Sarah) are shown to be preferable to the many children of error. The argument is supported by the quotation of 1 Sam. ii. 5, a quotation similar to that from Is. liv. 1 in Galatians. The actual passage from Isaiah is quoted in a similar sense in *De Execr.* 7 (M. II. 435). The importance of the association of these texts with Sarah lies in the fact that quotations from books outside the Pentateuch are comparatively rare in both writers.

Eph. ii. 19. Cf. *De Cherub.* 34 (M. I. 161), μόνος κύριος ὁ Θεὸς πολίτης, πάροικον δὲ καὶ ἐπήλυτον τὸ γεννητὸν ἅπαν. οἱ δὲ λεγόμενοι πολῖται καταχρήσει μᾶλλον ὀνόματος ἢ ἀληθείᾳ προσαγορεύονται.

Eph. v. 12 *seqq.* Cf. *Q.D.I.* 28 (M. I. 293), ὅταν δὲ εἰσέλθῃ ὁ ἱερεὺς ὄντως, ἔλεγχος, εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὥσπερ φωτός τις αὐγὴ καθαρωτάτη, τηνικαῦτα γνωρίζομεν τὰ ἐναποκειμένα ἡμῖν οὐκ εὐαγῆ τῇ ψυχῇ βουλεύματα. Cf. *De Jud.* 2 (M. II. 345).

Eph. vi. 2. Cf. *De Par. Col.* 11 (Mai 35) for a comment on the fact that this is the first commandment to the observance of which a promise of reward is attached.

Phil. iii. 20. Cf. *De Conf. Ling.* 17 (M. I. 416), πατρίδα μὲν τὸν οὐράνιον χῶρον ἐν ᾧ πολιτεύονται, ξένον δὲ τὸν περίγειον ἐν ᾧ παρῴκησαν νομίζουσαι.

It is of course clear that the whole attitude of the two writers is fundamentally different, but on the other hand the foregoing list shows that S. Paul to a large extent employs O.T. quotations which are also used by Philo, and that his method of treating them differs from Philo's mainly in respect of the substitution of the personality of Our Lord and the work of the Holy Ghost for Philo's abstract conceptions of reason, virtue, etc. In the light of these resemblances it is important to observe the resemblance between S. Paul's view of the Incarnation and Philo's account of the creation of man.

According to Philo God can create nothing but what is good, while man in fact is evil. This however is due to the fact that the man who is created by God is not the individual man, as he appears in the world, but an ideal man created in the image of God, and prior to individual men. This ideal man or idea of man is not material but heavenly, existing in the sphere of thought, not in that of sense, and incorruptible by nature. Individual men are the result of the union of copies of this divine idea of man with matter, the evil in man being due to the material element. The relation of this idea of man to the λόγος is not very clear; in *De Mund. Op.* 5 (M. 1. 4), the λόγος is the agent or faculty in the divine nature which is responsible for the creation of the whole ideal world (including the ideal man), which is anterior to the material world, while in § 6 of the same book the λόγος is the νοητὸς κόσμος which is the same as the ideal world as existing in the mind of God. Yet in § 8 the ἀόρατος...λόγος is the image of God, and therefore apparently the idea of man. In *Leg. Alleg.* iii. 31 (M. 1. 106), the λόγος is the copy of the divine nature, and the created world is a copy of the λόγος, the latter being used by God as His instrument in Creation. On the other hand in *Q.R.D.H.* 48 (M. 1. 505), the λόγος is a copy of the divine reason and the pattern of the human reason, and therefore identical with the divine idea of man rather than with the divine idea of the whole world. Fortunately it is not necessary to attempt to elucidate Philo's incoherencies, since S. Paul makes no use of the conception of the λόγος. The important point is to notice the language in which Philo describes that idea or divine pattern of man of which individual men are copies. It will be seen that it is difficult to be certain of the extent to which this man is simply a conception existing in the divine mind, or, in so far as he is identical with the λόγος, a divine creative agency almost distinct from God, or again a divine creation separate from God and a model of which man is a copy. The following passages are the most relevant in view of their possible relation to Pauline thought with regard to the nature of Our Lord, as stated in the quotations from the Epistles which are printed opposite them.

1 Cor. xv. 45. οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν· ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν.

De Mund. Op. 46 (M. 1. 32). (Philo is commenting on Gen. ii. 7.) διαφορὰ παμμεγέθης ἐστὶ τοῦ τε νῦν πλασθέντος

ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν. ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοικός, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. οἷος ὁ χοικός, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ χοικοί, καὶ οἷος ὁ ἐπουράνιος, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ἐπουράνιοι. καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοικοῦ, φορέσωμεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου.

ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονότος πρότερον. ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαπλασθεὶς ἤδη, αἰσθητός, μετέχων ποιότητος, ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστώς...ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα ἰδέα τις ἢ γένος ἢ σφραγίς, νοητός, ἀσώματος οὔτ' ἄρρην οὔτε θῆλυς ἄφθαρτος φύσει· τοῦ δὲ αἰσθητοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ μέρους ἀνθρώπου τὴν κατασκευὴν σύνθετον εἶναί φησιν ἐκ γεώδους οὐσίας καὶ πνεύματος θείου, γεγενῆσθαι γὰρ τὸ μὲν σῶμα χοῦν τοῦ τεχνίτου λαβόντος, καὶ μορφὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ διαπλάσαντος.

Leg. Alleg. i. 12 (M. I. 49). (Again on Gen. ii. 7.) διττὰ ἀνθρώπων γένη· ὁ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος, ὁ δὲ γήϊνος. ὁ μὲν οὐράνιος, ἅτε κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονὼς φθαρτῆς καὶ συνόλως γεωδοῦς οὐσίας ἀμέτοχος· ὁ δὲ γήϊνος ἐκ σποράδος ὕλης ἣν χοῦν κέκληκεν ἐπάγη.

Leg. Alleg. i. 29 (M. I. 62). ὥστε ὅταν ἀκούῃς Ἀδὰμ γήϊνον καὶ φθαρτὸν εἶναι νόμιζε. ὁ γὰρ κατ' εἰκόνα οὐ γήϊνος ἀλλ' οὐράνιος.

Q.R.D.H. 12 (M. I. 481). (Cf. above on this passage and Ro. viii. 5, and note also 1 Cor. xv. 50.) ὥστε διττὸν εἶναι γένος ἀνθρώπων τὸ μὲν θείῳ πνεύματι καὶ λογισμῷ βιούντων, τὸ δὲ αἵματι καὶ σαρκὸς ἡδονῇ ζώντων. τοῦτο τὸ εἶδος πλάσμα ἐστὶ γῆς ἐκεῖνο δὲ θείας εἰκόνος ἐμφερὲς ἐκμαγεῖον. (For this conception cf. Eph. iv. 24.)

[S. Paul here makes the first man natural and the second man spiritual, the first earthy and the second heavenly. This is necessary for his purpose, since Our Lord, as the second Adam, is later than the first in respect of His manifestation in the temporal order. That S. Paul at this period regards Our Lord as a pre-existing being related to God in some unique manner is clear from 2 Cor. viii. 9 (the metaphor of riches and poverty is of course dictated by the circumstances in which the letter is written). It will of course be obvious that the conception of Our Lord as a heavenly counterpart of Adam is necessary to the argument of Ro. v. 12 *seqq.*, although the exact nature of his relation to Adam is nowhere explained in this passage, except in so far as the historical Adam is a type of Our Lord. The argument becomes clear if Our Lord is regarded as a divine pattern, of Whom Adam is a copy as in Philo, since it is then clear how the obedience of Our Lord can counterbalance the disobedience of the historical Adam.]

Phil. ii. 6. ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων.

Col. i. 15. ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐράνοις καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα... τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται.

Leg. Alleg. iii. 31 (M. I. 106). σκιὰ θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἔστιν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει... ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς παράδειγμα τῆς εἰκόνος ...οὕτως ἡ εἰκὼν ἄλλων γίγνεται παράδειγμα.

De Plant. 5 (M. I. 332). Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν (τὴν ψυχὴν) τοῦ θείου καὶ ἀοράτου εἰκόνα δόκιμον εἶναι νόμισας οὐσιωθεῖσαν καὶ τυπωθεῖσαν σφραγῖδι θεοῦ ἧς ὁ χαρακτὴρ ἐστιν ἀίδιος λόγος.

De Conf. Ling. 28 (M. I. 427). καὶ ἂν μηδέπω μέντοι τυγχάνῃ τις ἀξιόχρεως ὢν υἱὸς θεοῦ προσαγορεύεσθαι, σπουδαζέτω κοσμεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγον, τὸν ἄγγελον πρεσβύτατον...καὶ γὰρ εἰ μήπω ἱκανοὶ θεοῦ παῖδες νομίζεσθαι γεγόναμεν, ἀλλά τοι τῆς ἀιδίου εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ, λόγου τοῦ ἱερωτάτου. θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος. For further references to the λόγος as πρωτόγονος cf. Lightfoot on Col. i. 16, esp. *De Agric.* 12 (M. I. 308), where the λόγος appears as πρωτόγονος υἱός of God.

The foregoing comparison by no means proves that S. Paul has made any direct use of Philo. It must be remembered that we do not possess more than a part of the Alexandrine Jewish literature, and Philo himself refers frequently to other writers who have allegorized the Jewish Scriptures. Cf. *De Mund. Op.* 25 (M. I. 18), and elsewhere *passim*. Further in several passages it would be natural to find a resemblance between S. Paul and Philo, did they not both show an equal resemblance to Wisdom, *e.g.* 1 Cor. ii. 11 = Wisd. ix. 17 = *Leg. Alleg.* i. 13 (M. I. 51); it would be easy to multiply instances.

Thus it is by no means unreasonable to suppose that the resemblances between the thought of S. Paul and Philo are attributable to their common use of other writings now lost, which put forward the allegorical interpretation of Judaism on lines somewhat less radical than those favoured by Philo, and more in accordance with the letter of the O.T. and its traditional rabbinical interpretation. It is however quite possible that S. Paul may well have had some slight general acquaintance with Philo and incorporated such of his ideas as suited his purposes, while adapting them freely to his own far more Palestinian outlook. The question would be more easy to decide if Philo's two books περὶ διαθηκῶν had not been lost. From Philo's account of them in *De Mut. Nom.* 6 (M. I. 586), it is clear that they may well have borne a considerable resemblance to S. Paul's teaching in Gal. iii. 15 *seqq.*, and Ro. iv. 16 *seqq.* (διαθῆκαι δὲ ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ γράφονται τῶν δωρεᾶς ἀξίων ὥστε σύμβολον εἶναι διαθήκην χάριτος· ἣν μέσην ἔθηκεν ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτοῦ τε ὀρέγοντος καὶ ἄνθρωπον λαμβάνοντος· ὑπερβολὴ δὲ εὐεργεσίας τοῦτό ἐστι, μὴ εἶναι θεοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς μέσον ὅτι μὴ τὴν παρθένον χάριτα.) At the same time the probability is very strongly in favour of the view that the resemblances are due not to any direct contact but to the fact that both S. Paul and Philo are acquainted with and make use of the general outlook of Hellenistic Jewish thought and its conventional methods of

interpreting the Scriptures, whether as embodied in writings now lost, or as generally current in Hellenistic Judaism.

It is remarkable that S. Paul never makes use of the term λόγος with which he must have been well acquainted. Presumably he avoided it on purpose, preferring to use the conception of a divine prototype of humanity, who is both a copy of the divine nature and the pattern of the human nature, as lending itself more to a vivid personal conception of Our Lord, and avoiding the danger of representing Him as a mere philosophical abstraction, or a mythical personification similar to those of certain contemporary cults (see following Appendix).

APPENDIX II

S. PAUL AND HELLENISTIC RELIGION

NOTE. In this Appendix I have confined myself in the main to an investigation of the view of S. Paul's relation to the contemporary theological conceptions in which the mystery-religions found their expression put forward by Reitzenstein in his three books *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, *Poimandres* and *Erlösungsmysterium*. An adequate investigation of the whole matter would demand treatment in a separate volume, and does not fall strictly within the scope of an investigation of S. Paul's relation to the Church of Jerusalem. In general Reitzenstein's investigations are of the utmost importance as contributions to the understanding of S. Paul; but they suffer from a natural tendency to over-estimate the influence of "Hellenistic" conceptions on his thought and to find connections with it, where in fact there is none, or where the connection is due to the fact that such conceptions had already found their way into Judaism. [It must be added that he is too willing to accept views as to the authorship and reliability of certain documents of the N.T., which, if the account put forward in this book be correct, are quite untenable. This is particularly the case as regards the Acts.] At the same time it is necessary to point out that the tendency to regard it as impossible *a priori* that S. Paul should have borrowed ideas from such sources is entirely unjustifiable. A missionary cannot make his teaching felt, unless he accommodates it to the theological outlook of his hearers; and a teacher who could use the altar to the Unknown God at Athens for his text would not hesitate to use the far more enlightened conceptions as to the relations of God and man which meet us, sometimes veiled in a grotesque mythology, in Hellenistic religion.

For S. Paul Christianity is essentially a deliverance from sin which enables the believer to attain to personal unity with God. In preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles he was addressing circles which were anxiously looking for religions which would promise them deliverance of this kind. The decay of the old religions had left a general sense of helplessness. Mankind was entirely at the mercy of the blind powers which dominated the material world. It was governed by fate (*Poimandres*, § 15) or imprisoned in matter (cf. the Mandean and Manichean conceptions quoted by Reitzenstein, *Erlösungsmysterium*, 51), and at the mercy of the forces, usually the planets, which controlled them. It is indeed doubtful how far such a desire for deliverance was actually present to the mind of the Gentile public in general; but it is clear that there was a widespread sense

of dissatisfaction which would eagerly accept any revelation which offered deliverance from the material world. The popularity of Judaism lay in the fact that it offered in the Law and the worship of the synagogue a motive for resisting temptation, and held out the prospect of a glorious immortality (Wisdom iii) or the speedy establishment of a Messianic kingdom in which the convert could share. In the hands of Philo it could again be made the religious expression of an eclectic philosophy.

Judaism was however only one of many competing systems which offered this deliverance from fate and matter and the evil forces which ruled them. In theory we may distinguish into three main types the systems which offered to those who espoused them the means of escape to a higher stage of existence than that of mankind in general. The first is magic, which gave the adept the knowledge of the secret names and functions of the beings which stood behind the immediate powers which ruled the world, and of the means by which they could be enabled to perform his desires. The second type is religion in the proper sense, in which the believer learns the true nature of the divine being who rules the forces of nature and destiny, and is enabled by union with him to escape from the domination of the lower orders of existence. The third is philosophy, which enables the wise man to put himself outside the sway of the world of phenomena by the perception of its fundamental nothingness. Naturally the distinction of these three types is primarily theoretical. Magic and the lower forms of "Mystery-religion" are scarcely distinguishable, as again the higher forms of religion are often the inspiration of philosophy (cf. Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 5). In one or other of these three forms deliverance was being offered to mankind, in the Gentile world to which S. Paul addressed himself, by many besides the Jews. Although the exact date at which any of the well-known mystery-cults made its appearance in the regions visited by S. Paul is uncertain, it seems fairly clear that the influence of the conceptions on which those cults were based was at work before his mission to Tarsus, and that it had many opportunities of affecting his thoughts and writings.

At the same time it is necessary to use the utmost caution in attempting to trace this influence. In the first place any religion which offers the individual believer deliverance from the world by means of an immediate access to God (whether this deliverance be regarded as a deliverance from sin or from the material world and whether the deliverance be regarded as one immediately achieved, or as one to be achieved at best only in part in this life) is bound to express itself very largely in metaphor; and these metaphors are likely to be drawn from a comparatively limited stock. Thus the state of the believer after his conversion, as compared with his former condition, may easily and naturally be regarded as a waking from sleep, a

recovery from drunkenness, a life after death, or a new birth. (It is a little unfortunate that Reitzenstein, in attacking quite rightly the tendency to exaggerate the possibility of such independent uses of the same metaphor and the *a priori* refusal to admit that possibility of borrowing on S. Paul's part from Hellenistic religions, should attach his polemic to an attempt to find the inspiration of Eph. vi. 10 *seqq.* in heathen sources. For although the conception of the convert as the soldier of his faith may occur in heathen religions it is hardly disputable that S. Paul is in this instance borrowing from Wisd. v. 17, and that in his turn the author of Wisdom is borrowing from Is. lix. 17. See *Hell. Myst.-Rel.* 87, and the discussion of the passage in the foregoing Appendix.)

It is further necessary to observe that the conceptions current in Hellenistic religion had begun to influence Judaism some centuries before S. Paul's birth. Thus his beliefs as to the angelic beings described in n. 12 above are similar to those of contemporary Judaism; but the beliefs of his contemporaries on this subject were by no means of purely Jewish origin. The angels who govern the courses of the celestial bodies and the events of the world-order are in fact the planets which govern the affairs of mankind in the religion of Babylonia, but represented as angels in order to bring them into harmony with Jewish monotheism (cf. *Poimandres*, p. 69). This accommodation of alien elements to Judaism is obviously far older than S. Paul; it is as old as Daniel at least. These Babylonian conceptions however were not confined to their native home, but had been assimilated in Egypt to the general body of Hellenistic religious thought, and through it were able to exercise a continual influence on Judaism itself. Their influence is of the utmost importance in tracing the development of gnosticism, a point which need not be discussed here; the main point of interest so far as S. Paul is concerned is to note that while he entirely accepts their truth, he regards them, as the gnostics did not, as irrelevant for the Christian. His debt to this circle of ideas is not however limited to these rather irrelevant details. It has been noted in the foregoing Appendix that both S. Paul and Philo distinguish between two men, the earthly and the heavenly, but that S. Paul has necessarily to reverse the order, making the earthly man the first, and the heavenly the second. Our Lord as the "heavenly man" raises those who believe in Him from the purely material to the heavenly order. The conception however of the deliverance of man from the material order by a redeemer sent from heaven appears in the Iranian belief that the creator has left his spirit in matter until the time when he sends a messenger to summon it home. So elsewhere Adam as the first man is himself of heavenly substance, but is imprisoned in the material world until a heavenly messenger is sent to rescue him. (For these conceptions cf. Reitzenstein, *Erlösungsmysterium*,

52 *seqq.*, 107 *seqq.*) From the fact that this conception of a heavenly man has influenced both S. Paul and Philo, it would seem that the Oriental conception of man as a divine being imprisoned in the material world, from which he needs a divine deliverance, has made its way into Judaism, although not to the same extent as the Oriental angelology which S. Paul shares with his contemporaries. So the Jewish sect of the Symmachians describes Our Lord as Adam and the universal soul, *i.e.* as the original heavenly being who is imprisoned in the material world, but is none the less able to separate Himself from it and by His appearance in the world to redeem that part of Himself which is still imprisoned, *i.e.* the souls of His followers. It is significant that this belief arises in a sect which regards S. James the Lord's brother as a twelfth Apostle and observes the Law. It need hardly be added that S. Paul's conception of Our Lord's action is essentially different. Our Lord is the pre-existent Messiah Who by His appearance and triumph over death has delivered man from the bondage of sin and given him a new life which will be completed at His second coming. But his whole conception of the Messianic activity of Our Lord as a personal redeemer, not a saviour of the nation, who will at His coming restore the righteous dead to life, has been profoundly influenced by ideas which are in their origin non-Jewish. At the same time it must be remembered that these ideas may have found a wide acceptance in Judaism in his time; the surviving literature is too scanty to enable us to judge how far in this and other cases he is working on a basis of ideas familiar to Judaism, even if non-Jewish in their origin.

Subject to these precautions it is possible to examine certain passages in which the influence of non-Jewish ideas seems to make itself particularly felt on the substance of S. Paul's thought. They are to be found in writings composed when he had been for many years a missionary to the Gentiles, and it is therefore of course uncertain how far in any case they were ideas with which he was familiar at the time of his conversion or how far they represent the influence of the Gentiles to whom he preached on his theological conceptions. A full investigation of these passages would involve treatment in a separate work devoted solely to the subject, and it is not possible here to do more than to consider one or two such passages, and to note the extent to which S. Paul's theology resembles and may be based on the conceptions which were current in Gentile religions, and the respects in which it was entirely distinct from those religions both in its outlook and in the conditions under which it was preached.

(*a*) 1 Cor. ii. 4 *seqq.* Throughout this passage S. Paul is writing in the terms which are familiar to the Hellenistic theology in which the mystery-cults developed.

The fact that he uses such technical terms as μυστήριον and τέλειος is

not necessarily a proof that he has such cults definitely in mind; any religion which distinguishes between lower and higher stages of knowledge must differentiate the fully-initiated from the beginner. Similarly any religion which claims to be a fuller revelation of a deity already worshipped but not perfectly known or understood must describe its new doctrines as μυστήρια, hidden hitherto, but now fully revealed. The word is used in 1 Enoch of the secrets revealed by the angels who sinned before the flood; but there are other mysteries not revealed to the angels at the time of their fall (xvi. 3), which appear to be those relating to the future punishment of the wicked, the coming of the Messiah and the reward of the righteous (cvi. 19). S. Paul's language in *vv.* 7, 8, is based on the conceptions of Jewish literature of the type of 1 Enoch; though of course this literature has been profoundly affected by the Oriental influences which were at work in Hellenism. Similarly the conception that the preaching of the Gospel must naturally be accompanied by manifestations of the Spirit and miraculous works, which Reitzenstein regards as characteristic of the preaching of mystery-cults (*Hell. Myst.-Rel.* 99), is drawn simply from the O.T. conceptions of prophecy, so far as S. Paul is concerned; its appearance in other cults is simply due to the natural tendency to regard frenzied and ecstatic speech, uttered under the influence of religious excitement, as due to possession by a divine being, who, since he is invisible, must be a spirit. On the other hand the difficult verses 10 *seqq.* are scarcely intelligible except in the light of Hellenistic ideas.

The argument ultimately rests on the belief that the πνεῦμα of man is an emanation from God, which is the source of life; the possession of this divine emanation is the fact which enables man to attain to the true knowledge of God by way of contemplation or vision, and it is by the union of the πνεῦμα (which may also be termed νοῦς) with God that man attains to immortality. S. Paul himself does not make this complete identification of the πνεῦμα of man with the divine spirit, and his argument is for this very reason obscure; he distinguishes between the Spirit of God and the spirit of the individual man, but presupposes that the spirit of man can be in some way which he does not state united to the divine spirit, and thus gain a power which is not vouchsafed to the ψυχικός, who, though he has presumably a human spirit, is none the less without a divine spirit. Thus the argument runs that S. Paul preaches a wisdom which only the τέλειος can understand; it was beyond the understanding of the supernatural beings who govern the world-order, but has been revealed to the Christian by the Spirit. The spirit is the only power which can understand the secrets whether of man or of God. The spirit of man enables him to understand himself; only the Spirit of God understands God. Now the Christian receives (presumably at Baptism) a gift of the spirit, but this is

not a spirit of the world, *i.e.* apparently a spirit which leaves him in the natural order of the world, but the Spirit of God Himself (possibly here "we" refers not to all Christians, but to those who like S. Paul are πνευματικοί). In virtue of this gift the Christian is able to understand the gifts of God to him, and to teach them in words which he himself is taught by the Spirit, judging each new spiritual revelation by those which he has already received. This is beyond the power of the natural man, for such things can only be investigated by the Spirit, which he does not possess. The spiritual man can examine these matters by the spiritual gifts bestowed upon him, but he himself is not liable to examination by others. Others cannot understand "the mind of the Lord"; but the spiritual man has the mind of Christ. (For the conception of the spiritual man as not being liable to criticism by others cf. *Didache* xi, and for the identification of νοῦς with πνεῦμα the quotation from Κρατὴρ ἢ Μονάς in *Hell. Myst.-Rel.* 190, ὅσοι μὲν οὖν ἐβαπτίσαντο τοῦ νοός, οὗτοι μέτεσχον τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τέλειοι ἐγένοντο ἄνθρωποι τὸν νοῦν δεξάμενοι.) S. Paul's argument is obscured by the fact that he nowhere explains the relation of the Spirit of God to the spirit of man. If the latter were simply an emission from the former, which must be roused to life in order to save the individual from the domination of the material world in which he is imprisoned, his argument would in itself be simpler (as is that of the mystery-theologies), but obviously contrary to his whole Jewish and Christian outlook. On the other hand if the spirit is simply the faculty of understanding spiritual things, it might be asked why the spirit of man cannot understand τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ. To make the argument complete S. Paul would have to explain the nature of the union of the Spirit of God with that of man, and the reason for which some men who are Christians and have received the Spirit none the less remain ψυχικοί.

(*b*) The difficulty presented by the fact that some people having received a revelation which ought to raise them from a natural to a spiritual order none the less remain on the natural level is one which is bound to present itself to all religions which offer a complete deliverance, whether from sin, or from the domination of the material world. Just as S. Paul has to deal with the problem of the Christian who goes on sinning (a person for whom his theology in the first instance made no allowance), so other teachers found it necessary to explain the reason why the deliverance which they promised only took effect gradually. This S. Paul does in several passages, notably Ro. viii. 18 *seqq.*, 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, iv. 16–v. 10. Here the Spirit given to the Christian is an ἀπαρχή or an ἀρραβών which gradually transforms him from the lower to the higher order. In the Christian it sets up the beginning of that spiritual dwelling which will hereafter replace the material dwelling of the body in which he now lives.

(It may be noted in passing that the admission was logically fatal to the arguments which S. Paul puts forward in Gal. against the need of observing the Law. The Jew could urge that the observance of the Law was the appointed means by which this gradual transformation must work itself out.)

It has been observed in the foregoing Appendix that the last of these three passages shows a close resemblance to Wisd. ix. 15, and Philo, *De Carit.* 4 (M. II. 387). Thus it is clear that the general conception of the body as a burden, which, being material, is evil in itself, so that it is desirable to be delivered from it, although alien to the O.T. is familiar to Hellenistic Jewish thought. Similarly the conception that the Resurrection will be accompanied by a glorification of the natural body into something incomparably better than the earthly body yet in some way identical with it is known to Jewish literature. The conception is found in 2 Bar. li. 10, 4 Macc. ix. 22, 1 En. lxii. 15 and elsewhere. In these passages however we are dealing with the rather crude metaphor of a change comparable to the putting on of garments of glory. S. Paul however goes beyond this. In Ro. viii the Spirit which we already possess is an ἀπαρχή which will work itself out in our liberation from the slavery to which the material creation is subject into a glorious liberty which awaits us. This thought is more fully developed in 2 Cor. iv. 16 *seqq.*, where the "inner man" is something which we already possess in an imperfect form in virtue of the ἀρραβών of the Spirit which we have received. Obviously the ἀρραβών here corresponds to the ἀπαρχή of Ro. It would be of interest to know exactly how S. Paul would explain the relation of the "inner man" to the ἀρραβών of the Spirit, but he gives no clear statement on this point. The passage is complicated by the introduction at v. 1 of the allusion to the earthly and the heavenly dwelling. The latter appears to be something already existing and awaiting us in heaven, which is to be superimposed on whatever remains after the destruction of the present earthly dwelling. Obviously this conception of a heavenly dwelling awaiting us goes far beyond the Jewish conception of heavenly garments or the transformation of the natural body into a glorious body. So too does the parallel conception of an inner man, existing in virtue of the ἀρραβών of the Spirit, which will ultimately work itself out into perfection in heaven. The two lines of thought are different ways of regarding the same process, which are not exactly harmonized. From the temporal point of view the inner man, existing in virtue of the ἀρραβών of the Spirit, works itself out into a state of ultimate perfection; from the point of view of eternity the heavenly dwelling is something eternal, which replaces the earthly dwelling gradually in proportion as the individual fits himself for it. The same general conception underlies the very peculiar metaphor of 2 Cor. iii. 18, where the soul is compared to a mirror, which by the continual

reflection of the glory of the Lord gradually becomes transformed into the likeness of that which it reflects. The accomplishment of this process is due to the action of the Spirit, who is the Lord.

In the last-mentioned passage there is a clear reminiscence of the conception of the divine Wisdom which meets us in Wisd. vii. 26; but S. Paul goes far beyond the writer of that book in his development of the idea. In Wisdom the Spirit (or Wisdom) makes men friends of God or prophets. Here we have the comparatively simple conception of a divine spirit inspiring men (for this conception in Jewish writings cf. *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 187 *seqq.*), whereas in 2 Cor. we have the conception of an infusion of the Spirit into the soul which ultimately transforms it into a copy of the nature of God. It is very difficult to find any strict parallel for this in Jewish thought. On the other hand similar and more advanced ideas are common in the theology of the mystery-cults. In this theology it is common to find the view that the soul is an emanation from the divine nature, or of a substance similar in kind to the divine, imprisoned in the material world and subject to the forces which dominate the lower sphere of existence. From this material sphere it must be delivered by the visitation of the divine spirit or the divine reason (the redeeming spirit may be personified in the central figure of a cult) in order that it may return to that full state of union with God which is its proper state of being. Thus in the highly syncretized Isis-mysteries of Corinth, described by Apuleius in *Metam.* xi. 23, 24, Lucius passes through twelve stages of initiation, represented by twelve different robes, which end in his public appearance before his fellow-worshippers arrayed as the Asiatic Sun-God (*Erlösungsmysterium*, 165 *seqq.*). The bluntest expression of this view appears in *Poimandres*, § 26, *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέλος τοῖς γνῶσιν ἐσχηκόσι θεωθῆναι*. For further parallels to the thought and language of these Pauline passages cf. the following:

Corp. Herm. XIII. 15. *καλῶς σπεύδεις λῦσαι τὸ σκῆνος.*

Poimandres, § 21. *φῶς καὶ ζωή ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος. ἐὰν οὖν μάθῃς ἑαυτὸν ἐκ ζωῆς καὶ φωτὸς ὄντα καὶ πιστεύσῃς ὅτι ἐκ τούτων τυγχάνεις εἰς ζωὴν πάλιν χωρήσεις.* (Here we have in a crude form a very clear instance of the conception of the soul as a divine emanation, which by knowledge and faith can be restored to its full share in the divine nature.)

Kenyon, *Greek Papyri*, I. 202. *ἐμβῆθι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ἵνα τυπώσηται τὴν ἀθάνατον μορφὴν ἐν φωτὶ κραταιῷ καὶ ἀφθάρτῳ.*

Corp. Herm. VII. 2, quoted by Reitzenstein in *Hell. Myst.-Rel.* 203. *ζητήσατε χειραγωγὸν τὸν ὁδηγήσοντα ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς τῆς γνώσεως θύρας...ἀφορῶντες τῇ καρδίᾳ εἰς τὸν ὁραθῆναι θέλοντα...πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ σε περιρρήξασθαι ὃν φορεῖς χιτῶνα...τὸν τῆς φθορᾶς δεσμόν...τὸν ζῶντα θάνατον* (the resemblance to 1 Cor. xv. 53 is obvious)*...τοιοῦτός ἐστιν ὃν ἐνεδύσω ἐχθρὸν χιτῶνα...ἵνα μὴ ἀναβλέψας...τὸ κάλλος τῆς ἀληθείας...μισήσῃς τὴν τούτου κακίαν, νόησας αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν ἣν ἐπεβούλευσέ σοι τὰ δοκοῦντα καὶ μὴ ὄντα αἰσθητήρια χαρισάμενος, τὰ δὲ νομιζόμενα αἰσθητήρια ἀναίσθητα ποιῶν τῇ πολλῇ ὕλῃ αὐτὰ ἀπόφραξας.* (Here the conception of a "heavenly body" or raiment which the soul can make its own is very clear; note the resemblance of the conception underlying the last clause to 2 Cor. iv. 18.)

Cf. also the alchemistic literature quoted *ib.* p. 166. *τὸ πῦρ ἐξήνεγκεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ σκότους εἰς φῶς...καὶ ἐνέδυσεν αὐτοὺς θείαν δόξαν πνευματικήν, ἣν οὐκ ἐνεδύσαντο τὸ πρίν*, and the discussion of 2 Cor. v by Reitzenstein in *Erlösungsmysterium*, 147, and his full exposition of these passages in *Hell. Myst.-Rel.*, an exposition which however must be read with considerable caution.

(*c*) It must be observed that in general Reitzenstein, while making invaluable contributions to the understanding of S. Paul's use of Hellenistic language and his adoption of Hellenistic conceptions, suffers from the almost inevitable tendency of specialists to find a confirmation of his views in passages where none in fact exists. So *e.g.* in *Hell. Myst.-Rel.* 144, where he quotes from *Corp. Herm.* XI. 20: *ἐὰν οὖν μὴ σεαυτὸν ἐξισάσῃς τῷ θεῷ, τὸν θεὸν νοῆσαι οὐ δύνασαι...ἐὰν δὲ κατακλείσῃς σου τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν τῷ σώματι καὶ ταπεινώσῃς αὐτὴν καὶ εἴπῃς "οὐδὲν νοῶ οὐδὲ δύναμαι, φοβοῦμαι τὴν θάλασσαν, εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβῆναι οὐ δύναμαι, οὐκ οἶδα τίς ἦμην οὐκ οἶδα τίς ἔσομαι," τί σοι καὶ τῷ θεῷ; οὐδὲν γὰρ δύνασαι τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν φιλοσώματος καὶ κακὸς ὢν νοῆσαι· ἡ γὰρ τελεία κακία ἀγνοεῖν τὸ θεῖον.*

Here Reitzenstein sees a philosophic statement based on various conceptions drawn from mystery-cults, no doubt correctly. There is also an obvious resemblance to Ro. x. 6, while the conception of passing through the sea in order to attain to heaven is to be found in the Mandean mystery-conception of the material world as the sea of corruption through which the soul must pass before it can attain to its deliverance. On the other hand the conception in Ro. x. 6, 7, is logically the exact opposite of that of *Corp. Herm.* S. Paul urges that the Gospel is easy and unlike the Law; the believer need not go up to heaven to bring Christ down, or go down to the abyss in order to raise Christ from the dead; the reader of *Corp. Herm.* is told that without an ambitious courage which will enable him to raise himself above the material world, so that he is higher than the height and lower than the deep, he cannot attain to true knowledge. But apart from the exact contrast of ideas, which might be due to deliberate polemic, the references to going up to heaven and down to the deep are in S. Paul drawn from the O.T., being based on Deut. xxx. 12, 13, the conception of the latter verse being modified by a reminiscence of Ps. cvii. 26; the quotation leads on naturally to that of Deut. xxx. 14, in *v.* 8. The same quotation is twice used by Philo (see previous Appendix). Here it is plain that we are dealing with a Jewish commonplace, used to prove in the synagogues the ease of observing the Law, modified by S. Paul in virtue of the historic fact of the Incarnation. The Christian has not to find salvation by the impossible task of observing the Law; he has not to go up to heaven to find Christ for himself, for Christ has appeared; he has not to go down to the abyss, for Christ has risen from the dead. Here, if there is any literary connection, which seems highly probable, it can only be due to the fact that the heathen writer has taken a phrase in common use in the Church or the synagogue and reversed it with a controversial

purpose; otherwise we have a very striking resemblance, which is none the less purely accidental. I have dealt with the passage at some length, in spite of its unimportance, as showing the great care that is needed in drawing definite conclusions in this field; Reitzenstein has been led entirely astray by omitting to notice the connection with the O.T.

In general it is safe to state that the theology of S. Paul shows a very close similarity to that of the theology which underlay the development of the Hellenistic mystery-religions of his time. In part at least this was due to the fact that he was working largely on material similar in kind to that which underlay the mystery-cults, *i.e.* an ancient Oriental religion, which in its literal expression contained innumerable crudities, but was capable of an allegorical interpretation. In this respect however not only S. Paul but the whole of Hellenistic Judaism was in the same position as the exponents of the mystery-cults. Further however the central fact in S. Paul's message was that man could find by faith in Our Lord deliverance from the misery of the present world and admission into a state of salvation, realized partly in this life and partly in the future. The means by which this deliverance was accomplished was the union of the soul with God through faith in Christ—this state of union might be described as "being in Christ" or "in the Spirit." The necessary condition for it was a mystical death to sin and resurrection to a new life.

All these ideas are common in the literature of the mystery-cults and the philosophy by which they sought to commend themselves, or into which they were ultimately resolved as they ceased to be living religions. It has already been noted that the verbal resemblances which are to be found are in part due to the necessity of such ideas to any religious system which endeavours to meet the facts of experience as they present themselves to the enlightened religious consciousness. Further it would be impossible except in a treatise devoted to the study of this particular subject to decide how far such ideas had already been assimilated by Judaism in general before S. Paul's time; his borrowings of thought and language of this character may always be at second-hand, though it is noticeable that the influence is hardly apparent in the Galatian and Thessalonian Epistles, and strongest in 2 Cor. and the Epistles of the captivity. It is traceable in Romans, though not so obvious as in 2 Cor., a fact which is naturally to be ascribed to the Jewish readers to whom the greater part of the letter is addressed and the general subject-matter of the Epistle. A full discussion of the whole question would therefore involve an examination of the contents, teaching and genuineness of these letters, which falls outside the scope of the period of S. Paul's career dealt with in this book. None the less the fact that ideas of this kind become more prominent in the later

Epistles suggests that S. Paul allowed his teaching to develop in harmony with the most enlightened element of Gentile thought during the later years of his ministry. Once again however a further caution is needed; much of this class of literature is of uncertain date, and in many cases it is hard to be certain whether S. Paul has borrowed from the Gentiles or the Gentiles from S. Paul and from the literature of the synagogue and the Church in general. Similarly it is always difficult to make certain how far Gentile thought had already made use of the O.T. before S. Paul's time, just as it is also difficult to assert with confidence how far Jewish thought before S. Paul had already been influenced by Gentile theology of this class. The whole subject needs far more careful investigation before any confident pronouncement can be made.

In opposition to these resemblances it is perhaps necessary to emphasize the points in which S. Paul differs entirely from contemporary writers of this class. In the first place his faith depends entirely on the Resurrection of Our Lord as a historic fact. Although his own personal experience would no doubt have satisfied himself, yet he realizes that it would be worthless if the fact of the Resurrection could not be proved by the evidence of eyewitnesses. This carries with it the necessity of presenting his teaching in a form which will be recognized by those witnesses as identical with the teachings they had received from Our Lord Himself. Thus he is bound at all costs to preserve his unity with the Church of Jerusalem. His doctrine may be a development of theirs: it can never take a step which they would repudiate. Further S. Paul is always a Jew and Christianity is for him the true development of Judaism. Hence, although he may employ the language and ideas of Hellenistic thought, Hellenistic religion as such can never be anything but idolatry; he can never allow the syncretism which pervaded the mystery-cults of the period. Similarly the moral holiness which it was the aim of the Law, as interpreted by the Pharisees, to establish is a necessary presupposition of union with Christ or the receiving of the Spirit. (In what appears to be his original attitude as put forward in Gal. it is impossible for the Christian to sin, and he has to modify his original idea of the nature of the gift of righteousness conferred at baptism in order to explain the lapses of the Corinthians.) In this respect he differs absolutely from many of his contemporaries, though it is wrong to suppose that the mystery-cults were in all cases indifferent to morality. Further, although he falls at times into language which ultimately implies the inherent evil of matter, he was too good a Jew to adopt such a doctrine as part of his system. Similarly, although at times it might seem as though he regarded the soul as a mere emanation of the divine nature, whose end was to be re-absorbed in that nature, his system in fact contemplates the continued personal existence of the

individual and his ultimate re-union to or transformation into a glorified body at the day of judgment.

Of direct borrowing on the part of S. Paul from the religious institutions of the mystery-cults we have no clear evidence; and there is strong evidence to the contrary. In the first instance it must be remembered that he was throughout his career exposed to the criticism of the Hebrew Christians who would hardly have failed to seize upon anything in his teaching which could with any plausibility be represented as partaking in the idolatry of the heathen. On the other hand it is clear that they have not in fact criticized his attitude towards the person of Our Lord, his teaching on the subject of baptism and the Eucharist, or his teaching on the Spirit, except in so far as he uses it to prove that it releases the Christian from obedience to the Law. Now it is precisely in such points as these that Jewish opinion could not fail to notice any innovations which he had introduced, and to resent them with the utmost vigour. In regard to the person of Our Lord, the beliefs that He is the pre-existent Son of Man, that His death was the atonement for our sins, and that He rose from the dead on the third day, are all specifically non-Pauline, in the sense that they are doctrines which he either does not use, or which he always professes to have received from others. But the belief in Him as the "Son of Man" and in His death as the atonement for sin was, when ratified by His Resurrection, sufficient to bear the whole weight of S. Paul's Christology as a natural and legitimate development, in which Jewish Christians could find nothing to resent. With regard to baptism it is peculiarly important to observe that S. Paul only once describes its effect as regeneration or a new birth. He generally regards it as a death and resurrection to a new life. Both conceptions were common in the mystery-cults; the initiate might either be regarded as born again or as dying to the natural life and attaining to a new divine life. Both conceptions meet us in the New Testament, but except for Titus iii. 5, regeneration is confined to the Johannine writings. It is almost impossible to suppose that S. Paul was not familiar with the conception of true knowledge of God as conveying a new birth; and if so, it is remarkable that he seems to avoid it. The only natural explanation of the facts is that he does so deliberately in order to avoid the introduction of a conception which might be regarded as savouring of syncretism. The metaphor of a death and a resurrection for the effect of baptism could not be objected to in this way, since it was based on the historical facts of the death and Resurrection of Our Lord. The point is of considerable importance as indicating that S. Paul, as might be expected of a Pharisee, was anxious to avoid anything that might tend in the direction of syncretism with non-Christian cults.

In the same way it is safe to dismiss any attempt to show that the

introduction of the Eucharist as a ritual meal originating in the words of institution pronounced by Our Lord at the Last Supper is due to S. Paul, or that it is not part of the original belief and practice of the Church of Jerusalem. The friction between Gentile and Jewish Christianity, which dates from the foundation of the Church of Antioch, was far too vigorous to allow the introduction of a new piece of ritual to pass unchallenged. It must be remembered that doctrinal innovations are far easier to make than ritual ones. The former only excite the attention of the critical hearer or reader; the latter force themselves on the attention of all. It is safe to assume that the Eucharist as a ritual meal connected with the scene at the Last Supper was part of the practice of the primitive community at Jerusalem. (See further Appendix on the Eucharist.) The manifestation of the Spirit in the forms of speaking with tongues and prophecy is in any case as much a feature of Judaism as of other religions. It is probable that primitive Jewish views of the Spirit have been modified by external ideas; but the modification is not specifically Pauline.

From this point of view it is idle to inquire whether Christianity as developed by S. Paul was or was not a mystery-cult. Its main affinity to these cults lies in the fact that it offers salvation (conceived as deliverance from the bondage of sin) to all mankind alike by means of immediate access to God through the person of Our Lord, and that the offer is combined with a sacramental system. But the only point in this affinity which is purely Pauline is the universalism of Christianity. It seems probable that he emphasized the importance of the personal union with God bestowed on the believer in this world, and that primitive Jewish Christianity thought more of that union as awaiting its full consummation at the Second Coming; but this seems no more than a difference of emphasis. In all these respects Christianity was essentially a "mystery-religion." It is differentiated from those religions by the fact that it rests not on the ascription to a mythical personage of a new revelation of the means of salvation or an esoteric interpretation of the meaning of some existing cult, but on the recent historical facts of the life, death and Resurrection of Our Lord, and by its insistence on the necessity of holiness derived from the Old Testament. This differentiation is preserved and accentuated by its continued assertion of its position as the lawful successor of Judaism, and its resolute refusal to come to terms with any other form of religion, and its consequent formation of a definitely-organized community of local Churches, based on the model of the synagogues of the Dispersion.

It is of course necessary to distinguish between S. Paul's own conception of Christianity and the impression of it which his exposition might convey to his hearers. A Gentile convert, hearing of a religion which conferred "salvation" by granting freedom from sin and immediate knowledge of

God (in a mystical sense) by personal union with Christ through the gift of the Spirit, might well see in it a "mystery-religion" which gave to the γνωστικός or πνευματικός a complete liberty from all moral restraint. Such people were able to judge for themselves between right and wrong, and might therefore regard themselves as free from the restraints which bound the ordinary man. It must be remembered further that the religious enthusiasm known to ascetic theologians as "sensible devotion" may easily be induced by a passing fit of emotion, as is shown by its frequency in agitations of a "revivalist" type. But it is compatible with a very low standard of moral development, and can be reproduced in those who are making no attempt to practise the Christian life by the application of a suitable stimulus. It would seem that the Corinthians regarded the production of this emotional excitement as the end of religion, and supposed that those who attained to it through the suitable forms of initiation and observed the external cult of Christianity were thereby freed from sin and from all moral restraint, and admitted to the promise of immortality. The misconception would be facilitated by the fact that S. Paul was comparatively unfamiliar with the details of the earthly ministry of Our Lord, and was even liable in the heat of controversy to regard such knowledge as of comparatively small importance (2 Cor. v. 16). In this respect Pauline Christianity needed the corrective which only Hebrew Christianity could supply.

§ ii. THE CONVERSION OF CORNELIUS

Shortly after the departure of Saul from Jerusalem Peter's duties as supervisor of the Christian communities of Palestine[1] led him to visit the districts evangelized by Philip between Azotus and Caesarea. His visit was accompanied by remarkable manifestations of the miraculous gifts which contributed so largely to the early growth of the Church. In particular he was believed to have restored a dead woman, already a Christian, to life[2]. This occurrence took place at Joppa, and resulted in a large accession of converts. These however were exclusively drawn from the Jewish population. Although the district had a large Gentile population of Graeco-Syrian extraction, it was not likely that the Gentiles would take any interest in the appearance of a new religious development among their Jewish neighbours. The possession of Joppa had for some two centuries been disputed by the Jews against the Gentile settlers[3], whose penetration of the outlying regions of the Holy Land the Jews resented with the utmost bitterness. The result had been to produce in this part of Palestine a constant state of hostility between the native population and the Gentiles. The latter in particular lost no opportunity of displaying their contempt and hostility towards the Jewish religion.

In this region Peter could not fail to realize the difficulties which any attempt to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles was bound to involve. His attention had been drawn to the matter by the revolutionary attitude of Saul in regard to the question[4]. Hitherto Gentile converts had entered the Church as proselytes of Judaism[5], and their admission raised no difficulty. But an insistence on the necessity of circumcision implied the exclusion from the Church of all those who were not sufficiently attracted by Judaism to be willing to accept its obligations before assuming those of Christianity as well. Among the Gentile populations on the outskirts of Palestine this involved the practical exclusion of all Gentiles from the Church, since few were likely to accept the Christian faith if it involved the acceptance, as a necessary preliminary, of the despised and hated teachings of Judaism.

Peter had therefore considerable reasons for contemplating the possibility of a complete revision of the existing attitude of the Church to the Gentiles. Under the influence of these doubts and also of physical hunger, he received a vision in which he was ordered to abandon the distinction drawn by the Law between clean and unclean meats. Immediately afterwards he received a message re-

questing him to visit a certain Cornelius, a centurion of the Italian cohort stationed at Caesarea[6], who was an adherent of the Jewish religion, but not yet a proselyte. The request was based on a vision in which Cornelius himself was ordered to send for Peter. He was the centre of a small body of Gentiles at Caesarea, who were interested in the Jewish faith[7], and had heard reports of the new version of Judaism that Philip was already teaching in the city[8]. As an Italian by birth, and only stationed in Caesarea by the accidents of military service, Cornelius had no reason to share the violent anti-Semitic prejudices of the Palestinian Gentiles, which were particularly bitter in the city in which he resided.

Consequently when Peter proceeded, in spite of the difficulty involved in the fact that Cornelius was uncircumcised, to visit him at Caesarea and to preach the Gospel to him and his friends, he was able to do so in an atmosphere entirely different from that generally prevalent among the Gentiles of Palestine. As he spoke, the difficulty as to the exact relation to the Church of persons in the position of his hearers was settled in a conclusive manner. The Holy Ghost fell upon them in a form visible and unmistakable to those present, including certain Jewish Christians who had come with Peter from Joppa to assist him in his difficulty in dealing with uncircumcised Gentiles[9]. Since such manifestations were regarded as limited to those who enjoyed the fullest privileges of the Church, there could be no question of the admission of his hearers to baptism, in spite of the fact that they were still uncircumcised. Under the influence of the enthusiasm evoked by the occasion Peter agreed to prolong his residence with Cornelius for some days, although by doing so he was throwing to the winds the whole law of ceremonial purity by which the Jew was preserved from the contamination of the Gentiles[10].

Thus from a strict point of view the incident involved the whole principle of the relation of the Law to the Church; yet it might well be managed in such a way as to avoid raising the question in an acute practical form. For Cornelius as a devout follower of Judaism would probably not refuse to be circumcised, and so accept Christianity in a Jewish form. None the less on his return to Jerusalem the orthodox Jewish Christians[11] of the city attacked Peter's action vigorously as a breach of the law of ceremonial purity. Peter defended it on the ground of the divine authority which had commanded him to set out on his journey to Caesarea, and had ordered Cornelius to send for him, and also on the ground of the visible manifestation of the descent of the Holy Ghost on his hearers. Since

the latter had not even been baptized when they received the Holy Ghost, it was manifestly impossible for him to have taken any other course than that he had followed, without deliberately defying the will of God. To this line of argument there was no reply, and his defence was accepted by the Christians of Jerusalem. The incident had proved that it was possible for the Gentiles to receive the gift of "repentance unto life" without first satisfying the commands of the Law. On the other hand it was possible to interpret it as a special favour granted as a reward of the devotion of Cornelius, but not authorizing the general admission of Gentiles on similar terms[12]. Further it did not necessarily exclude his circumcision at a later date, in which case the relation of the new convert to the Church would raise no practical difficulty[13]. The incident therefore could be regarded as an isolated precedent which would involve no necessary change of principle, rather than as a final decision by the Church in favour of a general abandonment of the rule that the convert from the Gentiles must necessarily enter the Christian community as a proselyte of Judaism. The exceptional circumstances which accompanied it might well be urged as a proof that it could not be used as a test case for deciding the future conduct of the Church with regard to the Gentiles.

None the less the result of the whole affair was the consolidation within the Church of Jerusalem of the definitely Conservative section of opinion. The admission of Samaritans had already excited their opposition, especially at a time when there were many of the lost sheep of the house of Israel still unconverted. The teaching of Saul had not attracted their attention, since it was, so long as he remained in Jerusalem, purely theoretical, and had been confined to the Hellenist synagogues, with which the Hebrew Christians had little contact. The baptism of Cornelius involved a concrete problem, since it left them face to face with the prospect of the admission to the Church of uncircumcised Gentiles with whom they would be expected to eat at the common meals of the Church[14]. Such an action involved the abandonment of the whole Jewish Law, since it meant the abolition, as far as Christians were concerned, of one of the strictest requirements of the Jewish system. The party consisted in the main of those Hebrew Christians who, like S. Peter before his dealings with Cornelius, were proud of their zeal for the Law, and admired, but did not themselves follow, the strictness of the professing Pharisees[15]. The Pharisees themselves had little respect for the attitude of their admirers, since they saw no value in an insistence

on the circumcision of Gentile converts unless they were also required to observe the whole Pharisaical system.

At the moment the controversy was not pursued to a final decision. It was impossible to condemn Peter's action, but it was possible to regard it as leaving the whole matter open. Thus the question of the relation of the party of circumcision both to those whom they regarded as their leaders and to the conversion of the Gentiles remained for the moment undecided; but it was clear that the Gentiles would not succeed in entering the Church without circumcision except in the face of the strongest opposition.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV, SECTION II

1. Cf. c. III. § ii. n. 22.

2. See c. I. n. 30.

3. Cf. c. III. § ii. n. 3 for the quarrels of the Jews and Gentiles at Joppa and elsewhere in this region.

4. The vision of S. Peter which precedes his visit to Cornelius is apparently attributable, from the purely psychological point of view, to the effect on his mind, possibly hitherto not consciously realized, of the doctrines expounded to him by S. Paul on the occasion of his visit to Jerusalem and the manifest difficulty of hoping for the conversion of the Gentiles in this region, which was the natural starting-point for any attempt to evangelize the world in general, if the Church was to be confined to those who were prepared to become proselytes of Judaism. It may be noted that it takes its form from one of those elements of legal observance on which the ordinary Jew prided himself (Acts x. 14), while the Gentiles regarded them as ludicrous (c. I. n. 53), the form being in part dictated by physical hunger. It may be well to repeat that this explanation does not in any way affect the question of whether the vision was of divine origin or not; it only explains the psychological processes through which it was communicated to S. Peter.

5. Acts vi. 5. It is only reasonable to assume that other proselytes had been converted, though there is no direct evidence to this effect.

6. The description of Cornelius in x. 1 raises a difficulty. The *Cohors I Italica civium Romanorum* served in Syria for some time prior to A.D. 69 (cf. *G.J.V.* I. 462). On the other hand Caesarea was not in the province of Syria, but subject to the procurator of Judaea. The troops under the procurator were mainly composed of local auxiliaries, predominantly of Caesarean and Samaritan origin (*Antt.* XX. viii. 7), and on the transfer of Judaea to Herod Agrippa I the whole garrison seems to have been transferred with it (cf. *G.J.V.* I. 460). If so it is impossible to suppose that the garrison included any Italian troops, which could not have been transferred from the procurator to the command of a native prince.

On the other hand it is to be observed that the garrison of Caesarea, being composed of local Gentiles, and possibly Samaritans (see c. III. § i. n. 4), would share to the full the local prejudice against the Jews (cf. *Antt.* XVIII. iii. 2, XIX. ix. 2 (where their joy at the death of Agrippa was shared by the local population, and is apparently to be attributed to their dislike of subjection to a Jewish ruler), XX. v. 3, 4). This tells against the probability that a centurion of the local garrison would be found with several of his men adhering to the Jewish religion (Acts x. 7).

It is possible therefore that Cornelius was an officer of the Italian cohort, and that this body of troops, or a detachment under his command, was stationed at Caesarea, perhaps to meet some temporary need, before the accession of Herod Agrippa in A.D. 41 and withdrawn at that date. Another possible explanation is

that Cornelius was of Italian origin, but serving as a centurion, promoted from the ranks of a legion, in the local auxiliaries. (For such promotions cf. Cheeseman, *Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, 38.) S. Luke knowing this fact might easily assume him to be an officer of the Italian cohort, which he knew to have been stationed in Syria during part of the period covered by the Acts, and which would no doubt have been moved into Judaea on the occasions when the procurator of that province was compelled to call in the assistance of the legate of Syria. On the whole either explanation seems more probable than that a centurion of the local auxiliaries should be interested in the Jewish religion, though it cannot be said that this is impossible.

[It should be observed that the centurion of Lk. vii. 2 *seqq.* who sympathises with Judaism, although apparently not a proselyte, is an officer in the forces of Herod Antipas, which would presumably be drawn in the main from the Gentile population of Galilee. In these parts we hear less of Gentile hostility to the Jews, the Jewish population being apparently predominant in many cases with the result that the Gentiles found it wise to keep on friendly terms with them. Thus in *B.J.* II. xviii. 1 the outbreaks of hostility as between Jews and Gentiles in these regions took the form of massacres of Gentiles by the Jews. At Scythopolis the reverse was the case, but here the Jews were anxious to remain on friendly terms with the Gentiles and refused to join the rebellion; they were massacred by the Gentiles out of panic (*ib.* 3, 4). At an earlier date the relations were friendly (2 Macc. xii. 29). At Gerasa, in spite of an attack by the Jewish insurgents (*B.J.* II. xviii. 5), the local Jews were left unhurt.]

7. Acts x. 7, 24, 44. It is probable that these were Gentiles resident in Caesarea but not drawn from the native Graeco-Syrian population.

8. It is a little difficult to understand how it was that Cornelius had not heard of Christianity direct from Philip, since it would be natural to suppose that news of his teaching would be common property among the Jews and their adherents in Caesarea. Strictly speaking the words ὑμεῖς οἴδατε in Acts x. 37 should imply that Cornelius had in fact heard something of the career of Our Lord; but it is fairly obvious that as used they are no more than a literary device to explain that S. Peter would normally introduce into his teaching some account of the ministry of Our Lord, while avoiding the necessity of introducing such an account into the narrative at the moment. The actual wording of S. Luke's narrative of the vision of Cornelius and his words to S. Peter leave it uncertain whether he had heard anything of Christianity or not. The account in the text is only conjectural, but it seems most likely that Cornelius had heard some vague rumours of a new form of Jewish teaching, and possibly that a certain Peter was the leader of the new movement. In any case the presence of S. Peter at Joppa could hardly have been known to Cornelius, and the narrative of his vision as it stands seems to be incapable of explanation except as a divine revelation or a considerable exaggeration of the actual incident.

9. Acts x. 23, 45, xi. 12. The fact that these six Jewish Christians go with S. Peter from Joppa to Caesarea and thence accompany him to Jerusalem would seem to indicate that he was in some doubt from the beginning as to how to deal with Cornelius, and felt in need of moral support in case his action should be questioned by the Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem (cf. n. 11).

10. Even to enter the house of a Gentile involved ceremonial uncleanness (x. 28), while to eat with him involved a still greater violation of the Law (xi. 3, Gal. ii. 12, cf. Tobit i. 10, *Jub.* xxii. 16 and Charles' note *ad loc.*).

It is curious that the later development of Judaism in the Mishna *'Aboda Zara* is more liberal than the interpretations of the Law already quoted, since it contemplates the possibility of a Jew eating with a heathen, apparently regarding the practice as not necessarily involving uncleanness provided that due precautions are taken (v. 5). It is to be presumed that the standard in Palestine before the destruction of Jerusalem was found too strict to be enforced with absolute rigidity among the Jews of the Dispersion or among any Jews at a later date. None the less the refusal of the Jews of the Dispersion to eat with Gentiles was sufficiently frequent to be one of the features which excited the dislike and derision of Gentile writers (Tac. *Hist.* v. 5, and cf. the references given by Mayor on Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 103).

11. For the difficulty involved in the phrase οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς cf. c. III. § ii. n. 6. It may be noted that S. Paul makes no mention of any discussion of the question of circumcision during his first visit to Jerusalem, a fact which, if S. Luke is right in using a phrase which implies the existence of a party of circumcision before the baptism of Cornelius, confirms the view advanced in the previous section that his first visit was not of long duration and that the Hellenist synagogues were so isolated from those of the Hebrews that the Hebrew Christians were unaware of his views on the matter.

12. The emphasis laid on the piety of Cornelius (Acts x. 2, 4, 31, 35) suggests that it was a point emphasized by S. Peter in his defence of his action. It is noticeable that he insists throughout on the fact that he was at every step compelled to go forward by divine inspiration (xi. 9, 12, 15, 17). The narrative of the text appears to be the only satisfactory explanation of the fact that, in spite of this apparently decisive precedent, the Hebrew Christians continue to oppose the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles to the Church with undiminished vigour. It could always be urged that the case of Cornelius was exceptional, and that it could not therefore be taken as justifying the general admission of Gentiles not noticeable for their piety and not commended by the visible descent of the Holy Ghost before baptism. In point of fact we shall see that S. Paul uses the miracles which attended his labours among the Gentiles as a proof of the correctness of his action (c. VI. § ii. n. 38).

13. It would be interesting to know whether Cornelius was circumcised later, as Titus probably was (c. V. § iii. n. 19). Since he was already on the way to becoming a proselyte, he probably would be prepared to complete the process; and it is difficult to understand how he could avoid considerable difficulties in his relations with the Jewish Christians at Caesarea unless he was prepared to become a full proselyte.

14. See above, n. 10. It must be remembered that the admission of Gentiles to the Church involved their Jewish fellow-Christians in ceremonial uncleanness whenever they attended the common meal, which was the central point in the life of the Church. It was therefore impossible for the Jew to avoid Gentile society and the defilement which it involved, without some such expedient as that which S. Peter endeavoured to introduce at Antioch (see c. V. § iii. n. 24 and § iv. n. 4).

However much the matter may have been discussed at Jerusalem as a question of theory, the concrete fact of the admission of a Gentile to the Church would bring the opposition of the Hebrews to the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles to a head. Religious controversies rarely develop their full violence until the principle in dispute is asserted by one party in actual practice.

15. c. I. nn. 41, 46 and c. III. § ii. n. 36.

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH AT ANTIOCH

§ i. THE FIRST MISSIONARIES

SHORTLY after[1] the settlement of the controversy aroused by the conversion of Cornelius, the Church was faced by a difficulty of a similar character, but on a very much larger scale. The refugees who had left Jerusalem on the death of Stephen had included a certain number of Cypriot and Cyrenean Jews, who had abandoned all idea of returning to Jerusalem at the close of the persecution, and had decided to return to their native lands. Some of the Cypriots actually did so. Others, however, found their way to Antioch in the course of their journey, the city being the natural starting-point for the voyage from Syria[2]. They had however been impressed by the opening which they found for preaching the Gospel to the people of the city. The Jewish community at Antioch was large and influential. It enjoyed the same political rights as the native Syrian population, and had made so many converts among them that the racial distinction between Jew and Gentile was beginning to disappear, and to be replaced by a purely religious difference[3]. Thus the Jews at Antioch had no traditional hostility to the Gentiles as such, while the Gentiles knew Judaism as a religious cult which had many sympathisers of their own race. The appearance of a new version of Judaism which tended to obliterate the distinction between Jew and Gentile was not likely to excite in such an atmosphere the violent hostility of the Jews, as it had at Jerusalem, nor to be overlooked by the Gentiles on account of their contempt for everything of Jewish origin, as it was likely to be at Caesarea[4]. Further in the residence of the legate of Syria there was less to be feared from mob-violence than in the districts subject to the procurators of Judaea, who were drawn from an inferior class, and more open to corruption or intimidation on the part of the leading provincials[5].

In view of the enthusiasm with which the teaching and the martyrdom of Stephen had inspired his followers, it was only natural that the refugees should preach the Gospel in the synagogues of Antioch.

Hitherto their teaching had only affected the Jewish populations through which they had passed, but here it was inevitable that it should also reach the ears of the Gentiles whose interest in Judaism led them to attend the synagogues[6]. Of these there would be a considerable number at any moment, many of whom had not as yet reached the point of undergoing circumcision and thus becoming

actual proselytes[7]. A large number, both of Jews and Gentiles, embraced the new faith, and the first missionaries, brought to Christianity by the teaching of Stephen, refused to recognize the necessity for imposing on their converts the rite of circumcision in which they saw only part of the antiquated Jewish system. The Jews of the city were not remarkable for any peculiar zeal for the national faith, and, owing to the general smoothness of their relations with the Gentiles, they were quite prepared to tolerate the proceedings of the new sect of Judaism, even though its Jewish members were in the practice of associating with uncircumcised Gentiles in a manner that would have called for the severest condemnation from their more rigorist brethren in Judaea, or even from the general majority of the Jews of the Dispersion. Thus a community sprang up, composed of both Jews and Gentiles, which professed to be a distinct sect or school of thought within the limits of Judaism, but was not marked off by any open schism from the main body of the Jewish population[8].

The news of this departure reached the ears of the Church of Jerusalem, which could not accept the situation with indifference. They had been compelled to admit the possibility of the baptism of a devout Gentile, who had not yet been circumcised, when his conversion had been definitely guaranteed by divine manifestation; but such isolated cases could not be accepted as justifying the wholesale admission to Christian privileges of Gentiles who offered no guarantee of their willingness to observe the Law. The Law alone preserved the Chosen People from the abominations of the Gentiles; and there seemed every reason to suppose that the mixture of Jews with Gentiles, who did not keep the Law, would result not in the raising of the standard of the Gentiles but in the lowering of that of the Jews. In particular the moral level of Antioch was deplorably low[9]; and if the Church did not enforce the Law there it seemed likely that the whole standard of Christian and Jewish morality would be abandoned. Further, since the Gentiles of Antioch had already in many cases accepted the whole Jewish system, there seemed no reason why they should not continue to do so[10].

At the same time the position was not an easy one. The Apostles were not in Jerusalem when the news of the developments at Antioch arrived, and it was not certain that they would share entirely the attitude of the main body of the Hebrew Christians[11]. On the other hand it might well be denied that any authority less than the Twelve had any right to intervene. The Mother-Church might claim the respect of the younger bodies of Christians, but it could not claim

apart from the Twelve to direct the whole development of the Christian movement. Its members could claim the prestige due to converts of long standing, who had suffered persecution for the faith[12]; but among the evangelists of Antioch were several whose claims were as strong as any that the majority of the Hebrews could bring forward. Further, they could urge that their teaching was that of the martyr Stephen himself, and they might well refuse to listen to the protests of those who had no greater right to be heard than themselves[13].

In the circumstances there was one person who was peculiarly qualified for the task of pointing out to the new converts the dangers to which their undisciplined enthusiasm was leading. This was Barnabas. He was himself a Cypriot by origin, and therefore a compatriot, if not also a personal friend, of the teachers at Antioch. On the other hand he was their senior in order of conversion, and his benefactions to the Church at Jerusalem had secured him the respect of all those who had been familiar with the early history of the first Christian society. At the same time he had not, in spite of his Hellenist origin, adopted that radical view as to the abolition of the Law by the new revelation which had led to the disastrous persecution of Stephen and his friends, but had remained content with the traditional view of the obligation of observing the Law[14]. He thus enjoyed the full confidence of the Hebrew Christians, while at the same time his past and his Hellenist origin would commend him to the Christians at Antioch, and so enable him to carry out the difficult task of persuading the new converts to accept the views of Jerusalem without raising the delicate question of the right of that part of the Church to express any opinion in the matter at all. The fact that he appeared alone and not in the company of a colleague of Apostolic rank would tend to divest his visit of the appearance of a formal Apostolic visitation to settle the affairs of the Church of Antioch. Since Peter and his colleagues had not been consulted on the matter, it was obviously desirable to avoid any such appearance.

The result was not that expected. The signs of divine grace were too manifest in the Antiochene community to allow Barnabas to hesitate in approving their action in admitting the Gentile converts without insisting on their acceptance of the Law. Barnabas accepted with enthusiasm the policy of the first evangelists[15]. Meanwhile, however, it was desirable that the new departure should receive the full approval of the Church. His own status at Jerusalem before his departure and the commission given him by the Church of Jerusalem

gave him more or less the position of an Apostle, but precedent demanded that the organization of a new community should be the work of two persons of Apostolic rank[16]. In view of the importance both of the city of Antioch and of the new departure it was eminently desirable to proceed with all due regard for such considerations, and therefore a colleague was needed.

It was however a somewhat lengthy journey to Judaea, and it was probable that the Apostles would not be easy to find. The nature of their ministry involved prolonged absences from Jerusalem, and it was possible that Barnabas, if he returned thither, might have to wait for a considerable period before he could find a colleague. In view of his decision to accept the position at Antioch as he had found it, and in so doing to repudiate the whole policy of those who had sent him in the first instance, it was unthinkable that he should return there and wait for one of the Twelve to appear in the city. He could hardly hope to persuade the Hebrew Christians that his view was correct, and they would probably decide to replace him by some more trustworthy representative. Nor was it certain that any of the Twelve could be relied on to adopt his view in face of the certain opposition of the Church of Jerusalem[17].

One person, however, was obviously marked out as his colleague in the task of settling the new community on a basis which could claim full sanction from the rulers of the Christian body. Saul was to be heard of at Tarsus, which was more easily accessible from Antioch than was Jerusalem. His views on the position of Gentile converts were familiar to Barnabas who had been responsible for his acceptance by Peter. His claim to the rank of an Apostle had been recognized during his residence at Jerusalem and also in the formal commission given to him to preach at Tarsus[18]. His position as one who was well known for his observance of the Law in accordance with Pharisaic tradition would make it hard for the Christians at Jerusalem (who for the most part observed it only in the popular sense) to criticize him in any action he might take in regard to the necessity of imposing the Law on the Gentiles. Accordingly Barnabas gave his provisional blessing to the community, thereby confirming some, whose allegiance had been wavering in view of the probability that he would demand their submission to the burdens of proselytism[19], and made his way to Tarsus, returning thence with Saul to consolidate on a formal basis the work of the earlier missionaries.

In the body so formed the leadership of the Jewish converts remained with Barnabas, who as the senior in the faith naturally was

regarded as the more important of the two Apostles. The Jewish element in the Church was numerically the stronger, and it included the original missionaries, who, however, as disciples of Stephen retained little sympathy with any specifically Jewish outlook. None the less in the absence of any formal cleavage between the Church and the synagogue the Jewish element was bound to predominate in numbers, while the Gentiles recruited from the synagogues could not fail to regard with respect the nation from whom their knowledge of the faith had been derived[20]. Saul took into his charge the supervision of the Gentile section of the Church, the division however representing only an arrangement for purposes of general convenience. There was no attempt at any formal division between the two bodies, which continued to associate on a footing of complete equality[21].

NOTES TO CHAPTER V, SECTION I

1. The murder of S. Stephen falls at the end of A.D. 35 or at the beginning of A.D. 36 (c. II. n. 17). S. Paul's return to Jerusalem from Damascus "after three years," *i.e.* after one whole year and parts of two others, may be placed about the beginning of A.D. 38, since S. Paul would hardly write "after three years" unless fairly considerable portions of the two incomplete years were involved, as well as one complete year.

On the other hand, the incident of Acts xi. 27 *seqq.* falls before the murder of Caligula on Jan. 24 of A.D. 41 (see below, § ii. n. 6), or at any rate before the murder was known in Syria. Now this incident occurred after SS. Paul and Barnabas had been working for a year at Antioch together (see § ii. n. 1). Their joint ministry therefore cannot have begun later than the opening of A.D. 40.

Thus the arrival of the news of the departure with regard to the Gentiles at Antioch, the mission of S. Barnabas, and his journey to Tarsus, fall between the beginning of A.D. 38 and the end of A.D. 39. It seems certain that the Christians at Jerusalem knew at the time when S. Paul left the city for Tarsus that the Gospel had been preached at Antioch, but not that uncircumcised Gentiles had been admitted to the Church (cf. c. IV. § i. n. 68). It is clear that S. Paul had left Jerusalem before the discussion of the affair of Cornelius, which again clearly precedes the mission of S. Barnabas to Antioch. But the interval between S. Paul's departure for Tarsus and the arrival of the news as to the activities of the Hellenists cannot have been a very long one. It is indeed remarkable that the information as to their admission of Gentiles did not reach Jerusalem before his return from Damascus; but it is possible that there was a fairly long interval between the opening of the mission of the Hellenists in the Antiochene synagogues and the baptism of their first Gentile converts.

2. c. IV. § i. n. 68.

3. *B.J.* VII. iii. 3. (The successors of Antiochus Epiphanes) συνεχώρησαν αὐτοῖς (τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις) ἐξ ἴσου τῆς πόλεως τοῖς Ἕλλησιν μετέχειν...ἀεί τε προσαγόμενοι ταῖς θρησκείαις πολὺ πλῆθος Ἑλλήνων καὶ ἐκείνους τρόπῳ τινὶ μοῖραν αὐτῶν πεποίηντο. Cf. II. xviii. 5.

The description of Josephus as to the unity of the Jews and Gentiles is no doubt exaggerated, but it shows clearly that the distinction between Jews and Gentiles at Antioch was less marked than was usually the case, and that it was not attended by the hostility which prevailed on the borders of Judaea. It is to be observed that Schürer in *G.J.V.* III. 127 assumes on the strength of the feud between Jews and Gentiles at Antioch in the later period of the rebellion that the relations between

the two were normally hostile, as at Alexandria. The evidence of Josephus already quoted shows that this was not so. In fact, according to Josephus (*loc. cit.*), the relations remained friendly until the Gentiles were thrown into a panic by the alarmist rumours of a Jewish plot against the Gentiles spread by a Jewish renegade. His information coupled with the general hostility to the Jews evoked by the rebellion changed the attitude of the general population, which had hitherto been friendly. For the laxity of the Jews at Antioch cf. *Life and Times*, I. 74.

4. The fact that there were apparently no Gentile converts to Christianity in the Phoenician cities until a period later than the foundation of the Church of Antioch confirms the view that the first missionaries travelled direct to that city and began their work there shortly after the death of S. Stephen. It would be impossible to preach long in the synagogues of Phoenicia without attracting converts from among Gentile adherents of the synagogues. The Jews at Sidon were on comparatively friendly terms with the Gentiles (*B.J.* II. xviii. 5), and it is safe to assume that there were Gentile adherents of the synagogues. This is confirmed by the fact that in Acts xv. 3 the Christians of Phoenicia, like those of Samaria, support S. Paul as against the Hebrew Christians and are therefore mainly of Gentile origin (cf. c. III. § i. n. 12 (*c*), and below, c. VI. § ii. n. 30). Hence it seems probable that the words μηδενὶ λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις in Acts xi. 19 are strictly inaccurate. The preaching of Christianity in the synagogues of Phoenicia was bound to reach a certain number of Gentile adherents of those synagogues; presumably there were no baptized converts in them until after the foundation of the Antiochene community.

5. Antioch was the capital of Syria, one of the most important frontier-provinces of the Empire. It had a garrison of four legions, and its importance rendered it necessary to appoint as governor (*legatus Augusti pro praetore*) a reliable and competent commander. The presence of such a governor would make it dangerous for Jewish opponents of the Church to organize riots of the kind which occurred at Thessalonica and some of the smaller provincial cities. It may be noted that the anti-Jewish outbreaks which took place here during the rebellion were rendered possible by the depletion of the garrison, the 3rd legion having been withdrawn to Moesia and the 12th to Judaea (Tac. *Hist.* ii. 74 and v. 1), and by the fact that Caesennius Paetus, the legate nominated by Vespasian, had not yet reached the province (*B.J.* VII. iii. 4). Similar outbreaks occurred at Alexandria in A.D. 38 in spite of the importance of the city and the province of which it was the capital, but here they were rendered possible by the more or less open connivance of the prefect, A. Avillius Flaccus (Philo, *In Flaccum* (M. II. 517 *seqq.*), *passim*). The legates of Syria at this period appear in a very favourable light. L. Vitellius earns the praise of Tacitus (*in regendis provinciis prisca virtute egit*), while P. Petronius (39–42) showed remarkable forbearance and sympathy, as well as a high degree of courage in his dealings with the Jews over the matter of the statue of Caligula. At a later period the province was governed by Corbulo, the most distinguished commander of the age.

On the other hand, the procurators of Judaea were drawn from the financial staff of the Imperial household; they were of the equestrian class, and in the case of Judaea with a few exceptions very bad specimens of their type. (The appointment of Felix, an Imperial freedman, was of course an exceptional abuse.) Officers of this class were usually employed in turbulent districts where a small permanent military force was needed. In Judaea they showed themselves tyrannical and extortionate, while at the same time we meet with several instances of their complicity with the misdeeds of the rulers of the nation or even with less reputable forces in the political life of the country. For a general view of their character cf. *G.J.V.* I. 453 *seqq.* For the character of Pontius Pilate cf. c. I. n. 16. The characters of some of the later procurators will be dealt with below.

6. Acts xi. 20, where the reading Ἑλληνιστάς adopted by Westcott and Hort is entirely unmeaning, and is merely due to an unintelligent repetition of the word as employed in earlier chapters of the Acts. A Hellenist being *ex hypothesi* a Jew, the word here cannot stand in contrast to Ἰουδαίοις in *v.* 19. The contrast is invariably between Hellenists and Hebrews as in vi. 1. In point of fact all Jews at Antioch would be Hellenists apart from any Jews born in Judaea, who might

happen to have emigrated to Syria. Of these there would no doubt be a certain number at any given moment, as there were at Rome, where there was at one time a synagogue of Hebrews; but they do not come into question here. Even if there had been a synagogue of Hebrews at Antioch, it could not be described by the name Ἰουδαῖοι, nor is it credible that Hellenist refugees should have addressed themselves to it as against the Hellenist synagogues.

7. The existence of this class of loosely attached proselytes is one of the presuppositions of the whole narrative of the Acts and the Pauline Epistles; and without such a class the propagation of the Gospel would have taken an entirely different form. It is by itself sufficiently obvious that any synagogue which was attempting to carry on propaganda among the Gentiles would at any given moment have a certain number of adherents who had not yet seen their way to adopting the Jewish religion in full, and were receiving instruction of a preliminary character. For a full discussion of the point see *G.J.V.* III. 172 *seqq.*

8. The account given in the text as to the foundation of the Church of Antioch is based largely on conjecture, owing to the lack of direct evidence in S. Luke's narrative. It is clear from the account of the mission of S. Barnabas that the Antiochene community included a large number of Gentiles, and it is clear from Gal. ii. 12 that the Jewish and Gentile Christians were in the habit of eating together at the common meals of the Church, which it is fairly safe to assume were held weekly (cf. c. II. n. 1 and c. III. § ii. n. 25). The question however arises as to the extent to which the members of the new body were formally separated from the synagogues. We hear of no formal separation and no persecution.

It is indeed possible that the lack of information is simply due to the compression of S. Luke's narrative. On the other hand the severance of the Church from the synagogue at the Pisidian Antioch in Acts xiii. 46 seems to be introduced as a new departure on the part of S. Paul. If this interpretation is correct, it would seem that the Church existed at the Syrian Antioch with no definite separation from the synagogue, the Jewish Christians being regarded as an eccentric but harmless sect with some peculiar tenets of their own, much as the Church in Jerusalem had been regarded between the collapse of the early persecutions and the death of S. Stephen. The title Χριστιανοί would then simply be used to describe the Church as a particular Jewish sect. This view is to some extent supported by the story recorded in *Life and Times*, I. 74, of a special mission of three Rabbis to Antioch to counteract the growing laxity of the Jews of the city. It is possible that in fact the bulk of the Jewish converts as a body did not eat with the Gentiles, but only certain leaders (see below, n. 21), a practice which would avoid injuring the consciences of the weaker brethren and lessen the probability of friction with the synagogues; the fact that some Jewish leaders mixed freely with the Gentile converts would be enough to uphold the principle of the equality of both sections. It must however be recognized that it is perfectly possible that there was a formal expulsion of the Christian Jews and proselytes from the synagogues of Antioch. (Although Josephus mentions only one, there must have been more in the city.) The account given seems however to harmonize better with the existing evidence and the known laxity of Antiochene Judaism. The Latin form Χριστιανός is not surprising in view of the cosmopolitanism of the Judaism of the Dispersion and of Antioch itself. Cf. Ἀσιανός in Acts xx. 4 and Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 36 (M. II. 587), and Βακτριανός in *Antt.* I. vi. 4.

9. Juv. *Sat.* iii. 62, Propertius ii. 21. For a summary of the evidence see Leclercq in *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.* II. 2367, Art. "Antioche: Archéologie."

10. We are of course reduced to conjecture for the precise form in which the objections of the Hebrew Christians to the proceedings of the Hellenists at Antioch were expressed. The arguments stated in the text are those which they would naturally put forward (cf. c. I. nn. 49, 53). They were in fact the solid reasons in favour of the demand for the circumcision of the Gentiles. No doubt the demand was often inspired merely by a superstitious veneration for the letter of the Law or a blind prejudice against all Gentiles, or by the feeling that the Jew as such was better than the rest of the world. None the less the arguments stated in the text might well have been put forward in all sincerity by men to whom S. Paul's proceedings seemed hopelessly adventurous and irresponsible; and subsequent

events in some of the Pauline Churches might well have been brought forward in support of the Jewish case. The fact that S. Paul's position was accepted by the Church and justified by history should not be allowed to blind us to the rashness involved in such a venture, and one to which serious objections could be raised by perfectly honest and well-meaning men, who were quite capable of judging the conditions of the time with a reasonable sanity.

That the attitude of the Hebrews to the foundation of the Church at Antioch was in fact that described in the text is clear from the whole Lucan narrative. See the notes following.

11. Cf. c. III. § ii. n. 20. The conversion of the Samaritans was dealt with by the Apostles in Jerusalem, the conversion of Cornelius by the Apostles and brethren in Judaea. Here the mission of S. Barnabas emanates from the Church in Jerusalem. The competence of that body to deal with the matter at all would be by no means obvious, and this doubt is expressed in the fact that S. Barnabas is sent and sent alone. He is not strictly an Apostle and he goes without a colleague. In other words his mission is not a formal Apostolic mission to regulate the affairs of the new community, but an attempt by the Hebrew Christians to secure the circumcision of the Antiochene converts by diplomatic methods. That the Apostles, or at least some of the leaders among them, were never very enthusiastic about the imposition of the Law on the Gentiles and the consequent restriction of the Church to limits compatible with orthodox Judaism, is clear from the attitude of SS. Peter and John in Gal. i. 18 *seqq.*, Acts viii. 14, and the incident of Cornelius. For the attitude of S. James cf. c. III. § ii. n. 36. Personal contact with Our Lord would inevitably incline them to ignore the letter in favour of the spirit of the Law. The enthusiasm for the circumcision of Gentile converts proceeds throughout from the main body of the Hebrew converts of Jerusalem, who are normally able to enforce their views on the accredited rulers of the community.

12. Cf. c. III. § ii. n. 32.

13. The Hellenist missionaries would seem to have been converts of some standing. They are presumably to be identified with the prophets and teachers of Acts xiii. 1. The list is apparently given there in order of seniority, and thus we find that three besides S. Barnabas are regarded as holding a higher position than S. Paul. Cf. c. IV. § i. n. 68.

14. Cf. c. III. § ii. n. 4. The account of S. Barnabas given in the text seems the only possible explanation of his actions at this period. His Hellenist sympathies appear clearly in Acts ix. 27, where he is responsible for the introduction of S. Paul to the Church at Jerusalem, and in his whole action after his arrival at Antioch, where the fact that he brings in S. Paul to help him shows that he was acquainted with his views. Yet he is regarded as a safe emissary by the Hebrew Christians, and their view of his position is vindicated by his action on the occasion of S. Peter's visit (Gal. ii. 13).

15. Acts xi. 23, 24. The point of these sentences has been strangely overlooked. They are not a mere piece of conventional piety to describe the arrival of a prominent Christian in a new community, but an account of a complete and unexpected revolution in the attitude of S. Barnabas. He came to interfere with the whole movement, but decided that any attempt to do so would be working against manifest signs of divine grace. In particular the words *ὅτι ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως* are not a formula of introduction, due to S. Luke's forgetfulness of the fact that he has already introduced S. Barnabas at iv. 36. He is guilty of such a double introduction of Agabus at xi. 28 and xxi. 10, but while such a lapse is possible in the case of a minor character who only appears twice in the narrative, it is quite incredible in the case of a character of the prominence of S. Barnabas, who has already made two appearances, and is to be in the centre of his story from this point until the end of Acts xv. The words are intended to explain the reasons for the sudden change in his attitude. He was too good a man, and too full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, to condemn the work at Antioch; instead he rejoiced to see it, and proceeded to assist it to the utmost of his capacity.

16. The position of S. Barnabas at this point would appear to be as follows. He is not one of the Twelve, and therefore not in the strict sense an Apostle (see Appendix). None the less his eminence in the Church of Jerusalem, due to his

past benefactions and perhaps also to his abilities as a prophet (Acts xiii. 1, and cf. the name Barnabas or *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως*), entitled him there to a high degree of respect, which would be increased by the fact that the Twelve themselves were no longer in Jerusalem. If the evidence of Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 20) is to be accepted, he was one of the seventy disciples of Our Lord; but this is hardly to be relied on. None the less he had apparently been a witness of the Resurrection of Our Lord (which seems at this period a necessary qualification for claiming the title of Apostle at all), and in virtue of these qualifications, coupled with his past benefaction to the Church, he could be included in the number of those to whom in a looser sense the title of Apostle was applied. To these points must be added that he had a definite commission from the Church of Jerusalem to visit Antioch and regulate the affairs of the Christian community so far as possible. The commission would seem to have been very vague, presumably for the reasons suggested in n. 11, with the result that he was in fact able to act in a manner diametrically opposed to the intentions of those who had sent him. (For *ἐξαπέστειλεν* in Acts xi. 22 as implying a definite commission cf. c. IV. § i. n. 63.) It would seem that the combination of these various claims to consideration enabled him to feel secure in acting on his own responsibility, provided that he could find a colleague of sufficient rank to assist him. Without a colleague he could hardly expect that his work would be recognized as conveying formal Apostolic recognition to the community at Antioch, and thus the whole question might be raised afresh.

This explains his introduction of S. Paul. It is clear that he felt that he had some authority to deal with the position at Antioch, but that he needed the help of S. Paul in doing it. He clearly needed no assistance merely in preaching at Antioch; he had not been sent because help was needed, and there is no reason to suppose that the original evangelists needed any help. On the other hand he clearly did not feel that he had full powers to act by himself; his hesitation is not surprising in view of the doubtful nature of the claim of the Church of Jerusalem to intervene in the matter, and in view of the fact that he was doing exactly the reverse of what they had expected him to do.

17. We know too little of the attitude of the Twelve apart from SS. Peter and John to be able to judge their probable attitude to the admission of the Gentiles. Since however the two leaders were liable to waver, it is natural to suppose that their followers would be no more reliable. It must be remembered that some of them may have been strong supporters of the policy of circumcision.

18. Cf. c. IV. § i. nn. 49, 63. His claim to be an Apostle had of course only been recognized in the looser sense, though S. Paul himself refuses to recognize any distinction.

19. Acts xi. 23, where the curious phrase *παρεκάλει πάντας τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ κυρίῳ*, and the appended statement that a number of converts were added, seem naturally to imply that S. Barnabas gave assurances that all would be well, and therefore urged the Gentile converts to persevere in their religion, with the result that a number of sympathisers who had hesitated to accept baptism when they first heard of his visit and the attitude of Jerusalem decided to cast in their lot with the Church. It is however possible that the words simply imply a period of successful work before his departure to Tarsus. It would be natural for him to share the labours of the earlier evangelists for a time, and not to realize until the first enthusiasm was over both the need and the opportunity for placing the whole work at Antioch on a permanent basis. But the language employed is curious and suggests the account given in the text.

20. S. Paul's anxiety as to the situation at Antioch in Gal. ii would be unmeaning if the Jews were only a trifling minority of the converts at Antioch. In that case he could have ignored them; as it is, he fears that their influence will force the Gentiles to abandon his "Gospel." It seems therefore that the Jewish element is dominant in the community. Such a preponderance might be due merely to the fact that it included the most influential members of the Church, and did not involve any numerical superiority. Since however the main method of recruiting the community was probably still through the synagogues, it is likely that the majority of the converts were full proselytes or Jewish by origin.

21. The fact that S. Barnabas and the rest of the Jews can without much difficulty

separate themselves from the rest of the community in Gal. ii. 13 suggests that there was in practice a certain division between the two sections of the community and the functions of the two Apostles, but it cannot be regarded as certain. It is probable however that in normal daily life the Jews would avoid associating very closely with the Gentiles. Some at least would retain certain scruples as to the abandonment of the Law except where that abandonment was necessitated by the demands of the worship of the Church. They would continue to observe the sabbath and attend the worship of the synagogue, neither of which would be necessary for Gentiles who had not been full proselytes before their conversion, and of these there would be a considerable number (cf. Ro. xiv. 1 *seqq.*, where some of the Gentile converts are still observing some parts of the Jewish system while others are not). Thus it seems likely that in fact though not in theory there was a certain division. Cf. n. 8 above and c. VI. § i. n. 7.

§ ii. THE FAMINE PROPHECY AND THE SECOND PERSECUTION

Circumstances combined to favour the Christians of Antioch. The joint ministry of Saul and Barnabas continued for a period of a year with great success[1]. The opposition of the Hebrew Christians was in the meanwhile paralysed by the development of a crisis in the relations of the Roman Empire with the Jews. During A.D. 39 the unbalanced mind of the Emperor Caligula was drawn to the fact that the Jews alone refused him those divine honours which the rest of the world was perfectly ready to pay him. He determined to put an end to this failure to appreciate his importance and despatched Petronius[2] to Syria to replace Vitellius as legate with a commission to set up a colossal statue of himself as the central object of worship in the Temple at Jerusalem. The news of his designs was received with consternation throughout the whole Jewish world. It seemed that the proposal could only end in a rebellion in Judaea and a massacre of the Jews, which was likely to extend to all parts of the Roman Empire. The most vigorous representations were made to Petronius by the authorities of the Jewish nation; and the legate, realizing the true nature of the task he had undertaken, did his best to delay or avert the catastrophe; but although he risked his life in the matter, he could have but little hope of success.

Naturally the Hebrew Christians were no less appalled by the prospect than the rest of the Jewish nation. The Temple and its system of worship was an integral part of their religious life[3]. It seemed that the time foretold by the Master was at hand. The abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet was to be set up in the Temple[4]. Jesus Himself had said that this was to be one of the signs of the tribulations which He had foretold, and they could only suppose that the times of which He had spoken were imminent—the times of tribulation which were to usher in the

establishment of His kingdom. They could only look forward to the horrors of war, earthquakes, famine and pestilence. For the Church of Jerusalem the prospect was one of utter disaster. Its members had always endeavoured to realize in practice the ideal of perfection as taught by the Master. In particular they had always attempted to carry out in the most literal fashion His teaching on the subject of poverty. They depended for their living either on the bounty of occasional wealthy converts or on the labour of such of their members as were able to earn more than was necessary to supply their own personal livelihood. For the most part such earnings took the form of the produce of small holdings of land on the outskirts of the city; and the holders of such small properties would be the first to be overwhelmed by the calamities of war, famine and pestilence. The whole Church seemed faced with the prospect of annihilation, if the impending disasters were realized[5].

Such was the situation when in the course of A.D. 40 a body of Christian teachers of high standing in the Church appeared in Antioch on a mission from Jerusalem. They naturally found their way to the Christian community. At one of its meetings a member of the deputation named Agabus, famous for his powers of apocalyptic preaching, foretold the doom that was coming on the world[6]. His eloquence seemed to show that he was speaking by the direct inspiration of the Spirit of God. For most of the evils that he foretold the Christians of Antioch could provide no remedy. It was not so with regard to the prospect of famine. They depended for their living not on the scanty resources available for the Hebrew Christians, but on the commercial and industrial openings of the city of Antioch. They possessed a certain margin of wealth, which they could use for the benefit of their fellow-Christians[7], and since many of them were accustomed to pay an annual contribution to the upkeep of the Temple at Jerusalem it was natural that they should recognize the claims on their bounty of that part of the Church from which their own knowledge of the truth had come, and which claimed on the strength of its holiness the veneration of all Christians throughout Palestine[8]. Accordingly the Antiochenes agreed to collect alms to be held in readiness for the impending crisis. Such an action was the surest means of proving that in spite of their differences they were true to the faith that was taught by Jerusalem, and it was therefore warmly supported by Saul, the leader of the Gentile element within the Church[9]. Incidentally it rendered it a matter of the utmost difficulty for the Hebrews to criticize the failure of the Antiochenes

to observe the Law, and thus promised to lead to an indefinite postponement of the controversy. In fact the Jewish leaders departed without raising the question and the difficulty might well seem to have solved itself without any direct discussion.

The prospect of avoiding any open controversy was improved by a new disaster to the Church in Jerusalem. The Antiochene Christians were still occupied in raising by periodical contributions a fund for the relief of their Hebrew brethren during the coming tribulations, when, at the beginning of A.D. 41, the Emperor was assassinated. Not only did this involve the abandonment of his design for the desecration of the Temple; it also enabled Herod Agrippa[10], who had been largely instrumental in delaying the Imperial schemes, to obtain the throne of his grandfather as a reward for the assistance he had rendered to Claudius during the turmoil which arose in Rome at the time of the assassination of Caligula and the accession of the new Emperor. Herod himself observed, at least externally, the religious system of Judaism, and though his personal life might show little of the holiness which the Jewish religion aimed at inculcating he had a genuine veneration for the faith of his nation[11], and was sufficiently well acquainted with his fellow-countrymen to realize that his throne could only be secured by an apparent compliance with the strictest regulations of the Law and a careful conciliation of the spirit of unrest which the latest threat of Roman aggression had materially increased[12]. His task was not an easy one. The nationalist movement was inextricably involved in complicity with the purely criminal elements of society[13], while the standing quarrel between the Pharisees and the Sadducean ruling class made it difficult to conciliate the one without alienating the other. His task was further complicated by the necessity of retaining the loyalty of the Samaritans and the large Gentile population of his kingdom, who were bitterly hostile to the Jews, and were not likely to welcome the appearance of a Jewish monarch in Palestine[14].

On his arrival at Jerusalem in time for the Passover of A.D. 41 Herod's first task was to soothe the anger felt by the whole nation at the attempt to suppress the worship of the God of Israel by desecrating the place which He had chosen for His dwelling[15]. To achieve this object he made a display of the utmost generosity to the Temple and its devotees. His actions were calculated to conciliate the High Priest and his followers by enhancing the importance of the external cult of Judaism, and the Pharisees by proving his own personal devotion and his respect for the stricter forms of Jewish

piety, notably the Nazirite vow. In spite of this he felt it wise to depose Theophilus, the High Priest, one of the sons of Annas, in favour of Simon, son of Boethus. This family was as true to the Sadducean tradition as the house of Annas, and the change left the government of the city in the hands of the same oligarchic ruling class. None the less his action broke down the practical monopoly of the office which Annas and his family had enjoyed for many years, while the reversion to the Roman policy of an annual High Priesthood diminished the importance of the office, which the success of Theophilus in delaying the designs of Caligula had tended to enhance[16]. To reconcile public opinion to this action he proceeded to remit the house-tax in Jerusalem[17].

At the same time popular sentiment clamoured for a more dramatic vindication of the honour of the Temple. The Pharisees could afford to ignore outbursts of popular clamour, but the Sadducees did not enjoy a sufficiently good reputation to allow of their letting slip an opportunity of vindicating their zeal in the service of God. In any case the recent attempt of Caligula was a direct blow to the whole system of worship of which they were the accredited leaders; and however little they cared for Pharisaical piety, they had a genuine zeal for the maintenance of the national religion. It had been their policy to preserve it by the strictest loyalty to the Empire; and the insult of Caligula left them with a sense of a personal grievance to avenge. The Christian community formed the natural victim of the demand for vengeance. The Sadducees had always desired to suppress it; and though they had hitherto been kept in check by the Pharisees, it was easy on this occasion to excite popular hostility against a movement which showed so little enthusiasm for the popular form of patriotism or for its hopes for the temporal redemption of Israel[18].

Hence it was easy for the Jewish rulers to persuade Herod on his arrival to take measures for the suppression of the obnoxious movement. He could hardly refuse to gratify them in so small a matter, especially when by doing so he could testify to his orthodoxy in Judaism; for the new movement was regarded in many quarters as introducing strange doctrines into the Jewish faith. The celebration of the Passover naturally found several of the Twelve in Jerusalem, including Peter and James the son of Zebedee. The leading Christians of the city enjoyed too high a reputation for piety to be attacked with success; they were protected by their close relations with the Pharisees whom Herod would not desire to alienate, even if he could have ventured to risk a quarrel with them. On the other hand, this

support would not extend to the Galileans, who were of no account in the eyes of the Pharisees and the general public of Jerusalem, however high they might stand in the eyes of their fellow-Christians. Accordingly shortly before the opening of the Paschal festivities Herod proceeded to arrest James the son of Zebedee and to behead him. The popular approval which greeted this measure encouraged him to arrest Peter a few days later; but the arrest took place too late to allow of his execution until after the feast.

The whole scheme indeed was singularly unsuccessful. Had it been delayed until the time of the feast itself all the Galilean leaders might have been arrested in the city. As it was they were warned in time and did not visit the city for the Passover or else made good their escape so soon as the first arrests became known[19]. Peter himself succeeded in escaping from prison, by means which the Church regarded as due to direct divine intervention. None the less it was clearly unsafe for any of the Twelve to visit Jerusalem so long as Herod occupied the throne. Although he was hardly likely to trouble himself with any attempt to follow up the persecution outside the city and its immediate neighbourhood, it was always probable that any of the Twelve who might be found there would be denounced by someone anxious to earn the royal favour; and it was hardly conceivable that anyone of them who actually fell into Herod's hands would escape with his life. Accordingly, on the night of his escape, Peter commissioned the Christians who were assembled in the house of Mary, the sister of Barnabas[20]—a house which was used regularly as a place of Christian worship—to convey to James the Lord's brother the news of his escape. Peter's enforced departure involved James' succession to the government of the Church in the city in the place of the Twelve; it is possible that his message to James on the night of his escape was intended to carry with it a definite charge to this effect[21]. In practice the change involved was slight, since James had for the past five years practically assumed the control of the local administration of the Church[22]. He now succeeded to the place in the ranks of the Twelve left vacant by the death of James the son of Zebedee, and became the recognized representative of the Apostolic college in Jerusalem[23]. In the enforced haste of his departure Peter could not appeal to the community in general to appoint a new Apostle to succeed to the vacant place[24], but it was obvious that James the Lord's brother was the only Christian in the city who was safe from any attack that Herod might make and also of sufficient eminence in the Church to assume the

task of ruling it[25]. It was clearly out of the question to leave a community of such importance under the control of anyone who was not of the highest rank in the Church. It would have been natural to appoint a second person of equal rank to share with James the position of the Apostle of Jerusalem; but since his appointment filled up the number of twelve this was impossible[26].

Peter himself lost no time in leaving Jerusalem before Herod could learn of his escape. He made his way to the outlying parts of the country, where an efficient search was impossible[27]. Herod indeed was hardly likely to trouble himself any further in the matter; should he do so it would be an easy matter for Peter to escape into the province of Syria, outside his jurisdiction[28]. For the most part the Twelve could continue their labours in the synagogues of Judaea, Galilee and Samaria, so long as they were content to work in comparative obscurity and to avoid any open collisions with the authorities of the synagogue[29].

Meanwhile, however, the new ruler of the community was faced with the necessity of reconstituting that body. Hitherto the supervision which he had largely exercised in practice had been supported by the recurring visits of the Twelve. It seemed, however, probable that for some years to come he would have to perform his task unaided. In a society largely dominated by expectations of the immediate return of the Lord, and relying for guidance on the phenomena of speaking with tongues and prophecy, it was essential to secure the existence of an authority strong enough to resist the introduction of new teachings contrary to those of Jesus Himself, and to preserve the moral standards of the Christian body. James himself had witnessed but little of the public ministry and teaching of the Master, and his position rested mainly on his own personal qualities and his obvious claim to succeed to the position of the chosen disciples of Jesus. Since, however, owing to the haste of Peter's departure, he had never received the formal commission of the Church his claim might well be questioned in a society accustomed to a large degree of self-government.

It was therefore desirable for James to strengthen his position by associating with himself a body of persons qualified to share in the work of governing the community[30]. They were for the most part chosen from the older converts, who had been witnesses of the earthly ministry and Resurrection of the Lord. In some cases at least they had been present on the occasion when He had after His Resurrection given His followers a solemn charge to preach the Gospel[31]; and

they had by their stedfastness in the faith, often in the face of persecution, proved themselves worthy of the highest trust[32]. Although we have no direct information on the point, it seems safe to conjecture that the presbyters, who meet us henceforward at Jerusalem, were appointed on this occasion. It is further a probable conjecture that the first college of presbyters numbered seventy. This was the number of elders originally chosen to assist Moses in the desert. In Jewish eyes the original seventy survived in the Sanhedrin, the living embodiment of the Mosaic court. In a Jewish community it was almost necessary that the number of seventy should be fixed for such a council to occupy the second position under a supreme council of twelve[33]. It was only natural that all of them, at any rate all who had received no direct authority from the Lord Himself, should be admitted to their duties with a solemn service of prayer and imposition of hands[34].

The effect of this arrangement was to enhance the strength of the Church of Jerusalem. It possessed a government of its own and a power to express its views which was independent of the Twelve. The scattered communities of Palestine might possess local rulers, but apart from the Apostles they had no means of acting together, or expressing a collective opinion. Nor had such local rulers the same claim on the respect of Christians. The communities of Judaea were not likely to disagree with the new body, which represented that zeal for the popular standard of Judaism and respect for Pharisaical tradition which characterized the Jews of the country. But it formed a body of opinion which could hardly fail to come into collision with the only other Christian body which possessed a vigorous organization of its own, the Church of Antioch. Incidentally, if the suggestion put forward above be correct, the mere fact that the number of members of the new council corresponded with that of the Sanhedrin could scarcely fail to suggest to its members and to Jewish Christians in general that it possessed the supreme authority over the whole Church which the Sanhedrin claimed over the whole nation[35]. The Twelve were now rarely able to meet, since they could no longer attend the national festivals at Jerusalem; and the new body might well assume in the minds of Hebrew Christians the position of the supreme authority in the Christian world. For the moment the danger of persecution prevented any controversy among Christians; but there was every prospect that the reorganized Church of Jerusalem might prove more vigorous in asserting its views than the original community under the nominal rule of the Twelve had ever been.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V, SECTION II

1. Acts xi. 26, 27, where the whole year marks the duration of the joint ministry of SS. Paul and Barnabas prior to the visit of the prophets from Jerusalem.

2. P. Petronius held the post of legate of Syria from A.D. 39 to 42. His attitude towards the Jews shows him in a very favourable light. For the whole history of the attempt of Caligula and the negotiations between the Jews and Petronius, as well as the part played in the matter by Herod Agrippa, cf. *Antt.* XVIII. viii, *B.J.* II. x, Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 31 *seqq.* (M. II. 576 *seqq.*). For the date cf. *G.J.V.* I. 334.

3. c. I. n. 22.

4. Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11, Mk xiii. 14, Mt. xxiv. 15. According to the Gospel versions of Our Lord's words the Final Consummation was to begin with famines, earthquakes, wars and similar portents which were to precede the setting-up of the abomination of desolation; but the fact that the threat of the establishment of the abomination preceded the tribulations, instead of coming as their climax, would hardly be felt as a difficulty by those accustomed to the apocalyptic atmosphere. For the influence of the attempt of Caligula on the speculations of Christian eschatology cf. below, § iii. n. 9.

[The actual extent and meaning of Our Lord's eschatological utterances fall outside the scope of this book.]

5. See c. I. n. 28. The inability of the small landholder to face disasters such as those which figure in Mk xiii. 8 was of course the cause of the economic crises which are a recurring feature of the history of the city-states of antiquity, including those of Palestine. Cf. Neh. v. 3 *seqq.* for the effect of a famine at Jerusalem.

6. In spite of the typically inept addition of the Bezan version in Acts xi. 28 (ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις) it is clear that in normal times a visit by leading members of the Church in Jerusalem to the Church of Antioch could only have resulted in a controversy over the question of circumcision. The account given in the text explains alike the absence of any controversy on the point and also the singular accuracy of the prophecy. The prophets come to Antioch not on a mere visit of friendship, nor yet to discuss the question of circumcision, but to foretell the coming end of all things revealed by the attempt to desecrate the Temple and possibly to enlist the sympathy of the Antiochenes in the tribulations, which the Hebrew Christians would be the first to suffer.

With regard to the famine see below, § iii. n. 10. If the explanation given in the text be correct it would seem probable that the original prophecy was wider in its scope and included earthquakes, pestilence and wars. These elements were forgotten, the famine being remembered because it actually occurred. The fact that the other portents did not materialize would not discourage the apocalyptist, since the various signs might come singly and at considerable intervals. Thus in Rev. vi the seals are opened singly.

Granting the explanation given above it follows that the date of the whole incident falls between the arrival of Petronius in Syria in A.D. 39 with orders to set up the statue, and the murder of Caligula in the January of A.D. 41. (It would of course take a few weeks for the news to reach Palestine.) This agrees with the dates given above (§ i. n. 1). S. Paul leaves for Tarsus in A.D. 38, and after a ministry of some months there is recalled to Antioch by S. Barnabas. The joint ministry of the two at Antioch lasts from the end of A.D. 39 to the end of A.D. 40. It is to be noted that the statement that the famine occurred ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου can only mean that the prophecy was delivered ἐπὶ Γαΐου. (Obviously the reign of Tiberius is out of the question.) It would be meaningless except as indicating that the prophecy was delivered in the reign of a different Emperor from that in which it was fulfilled.

7. The Jewish colony at Antioch was probably a wealthy one (cf. § i. n. 3). Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod the Tetrarch, was presumably a person of some wealth, and there may have been other wealthy Jewish converts. The Gentile adherents of Judaism, who formed the main source of supply for the Church, were often wealthy. (Cf. Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 4, *Antt.* XVIII. iii. 5, and see below, c. VI. § i. n. 9.) Hence it is probable that there were a considerable number of quite wealthy converts. Further it must be remembered that the period was one

in which persons freed from slavery often made large fortunes, while it was common for them to attain to a position of comfortable independence (cf. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to M. Aurelius*, I. iii). Thus the fact that Christianity numbered many persons of the servile class among its followers would not prevent it from having a number of followers who were able to contribute freely to the needs of the Church of Jerusalem.

8. For the whole relation of the Christian collections for the Hebrews to the Jewish collections for the Temple see below, c. VII. § i. n. 4. Jewish converts and proselytes would see nothing unnatural in being asked to assist the Church in the Holy City. For the poverty of the Hebrew Christians of Jerusalem see c. I. n. 28, and for the veneration which it won for them throughout the Christian world see below, § iii. n. 20.

9. Gal. ii. 10.

10. Herod Agrippa I, grandson of Herod the Great and son of Aristobulus. For his share in the accession of Claudius cf. *Antt.* XIX. iv. He had received from Caligula the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias with the title of king, and later the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas (Galilee). Claudius added Judaea proper and Samaria (cf. *G.J.V.* I. 552).

11. It is clear that he had no genuine devotion to the spiritual and ethical side of Judaism. His youthful adventures as recorded in *Antt.* XVIII. vi were thoroughly disreputable and he had passed a considerable period of his life at the courts of Tiberius and Caligula. His devotion to Judaism only manifested itself on his accession to the kingdom of Judaea. Even during his rule, of which Josephus speaks with the highest praise, he gave a gladiatorial display at Berytus (*Antt.* XIX. vii. 5). Josephus makes a rather laborious attempt to excuse him on the ground that the gladiators were criminals; but for the Jewish opinion of such shows cf. *Antt.* XV. viii. 1. None the less he did not merely conform to the Law out of a desire to conciliate his subjects; his intervention in the attempt of Caligula to set up his statue in the Temple involved him in grave personal risk (Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 35 *seqq.*, M. II. 584) at a time when he had no immediate personal concern in the matter beyond his love of his nation and his belief in the Jewish religion. It is presumable that he had a quite genuine belief in Judaism as a religious system, but did not allow it to interfere with his personal conduct until after his accession, when his display of devotion was no doubt largely assumed for political purposes. Similar inconsistencies are to be found in the history of Christian rulers.

12. For the danger of a rebellion at the moment cf. the rescript of Petronius quoted in *Antt.* XIX. vi. 3, *ἵνα μὴ ἀφορμῆς δραξάμενον τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμύνης προφάσεως συναθροισθὲν εἰς ἀπόνοιαν χωρῇ*. It is not improbable that Herod's action in fortifying Jerusalem (*Antt.* XIX. vii. 2) and possibly his negotiations with the neighbouring subject-princes (*ib.* viii. 1) were intended to conciliate the patriots by showing his sympathy with their hopes for the restoration of national independence.

13. c. I. n. 10.

14. Cf. c. III. § i. n. 4 and § ii. n. 3. In fact in spite of his attempts to conciliate them as recorded in *Antt.* XIX. vii. 3 (attempts which caused some offence to the stricter Jews (*ib.* 4)), Herod was exceedingly unpopular among his Gentile subjects, as their behaviour at his death showed (*Antt.* XIX. ix. 1).

15. Caligula was murdered on Jan. 24. The disturbances which followed before Claudius was firmly established as Emperor occupied a very brief period, and Josephus comments on the haste with which Herod, on receiving the kingdom of Judaea, returned to Jerusalem (*Antt.* XIX. vi. 1). He could not of course reach the city in time for the Passover unless he was prepared to take the risk of sailing during the winter season, but there are fairly numerous instances of voyages made at such seasons for urgent reasons (cf. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 376, Art. "Roads and Travel in N.T.").

That his arrival coincided with some great festival seems clear from the fact that on his arrival he defrayed the expenses of a number of Nazirites. Although the Nazirite vow could terminate at any time of the year it seems from Acts xx. 16 and xxi. 23 that it was customary to make its termination coincide with one of the great festivals. Indeed since the requisite sacrifices could only be offered in

Jerusalem, it would be only natural for Jews living abroad or in the remoter parts of the country to make the visit which terminated their vow coincide if possible with the Passover. It is scarcely likely that there would be any large number of Nazirites waiting to fulfil their vow at other seasons. Further, it would obviously be in accordance with Herod's policy to make every effort to arrive in time for the Passover of the year of his accession, in order to demonstrate his piety.

The length of time which his journey would take would seem to be about fifty days (see c. II. n. 17). Herod could hardly improve to any considerable extent on the speed taken by the official messenger, sent to inform Vitellius of the death of Tiberius, especially as he had to start earlier in the year and travelling conditions would normally be slower. The Passover in A.D. 41 fell on April 4 (Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, 279), and there seems no reason why Herod should not have started early in February. The journey would need to be made rapidly, but Josephus notes its speed; it was by no means impossible, if the conditions happened to be favourable.

Thus it seems probable that Herod actually reached Jerusalem in time for the Passover of A.D. 41. In this case it is natural to see in the execution of S. James the son of Zebedee an incident in the opening outburst of piety, which marked his arrival in Jerusalem (*Antt.* XIX. vi. 1). This view is confirmed by the fact that S. Luke in Acts xii. 1 represents the execution as falling about the same time as the decision of the Antiochenes to send assistance to Jerusalem. (The actual visit of SS. Paul and Barnabas of course falls later after the period of Herod's reign, the interval being marked by the word διέτριβεν in *v.* 19.) This suggests that the visit of the prophets from Jerusalem fell at the end of Caligula's reign, and the persecution a few months later. S. Luke's language is of course too vague to be pressed here.

Another slight confirmation of the date is the tradition recorded by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 762) and Apollonius as quoted in *H.E.* v. 18 that Our Lord commanded the Twelve not to leave Jerusalem until twelve years after His Ascension. If the generally accepted date of the Crucifixion, A.D. 29, be correct, we do in fact get exactly twelve years between the Easter of the Crucifixion and the Easter of A.D. 41, when the persecution of Herod rendered it necessary for the Twelve to contemplate the probability of a more or less final separation from the Holy City (see n. 30). Actually they were able to return not very long afterwards, *i.e.* after Herod's death in A.D. 44, but the persecution marks the end of the period in which their ministry, although largely passed in the outlying regions of Judaea, did in fact centre on Jerusalem. It is not likely that the ascription of the command to Our Lord is correct; but the tradition is ancient and well supported and may be due to the natural tendency to explain actual events by ascribing them to His commands. Thus if the Twelve did actually leave Jerusalem in A.D. 41, twelve years after the Crucifixion, a tradition of this kind might well spring up, especially in view of the numerical coincidence of the number of years and the number of the Apostles. Consequently it seems probable that Herod's arrival and the execution of S. James fall at the same time, namely the Passover of A.D. 41. For the motives for the persecution see below, n. 18.

16. It seems reasonable to suppose that the failure of Caligula's schemes would be regarded as a personal triumph for Theophilus (cf. the narratives referred to in n. 2).

17. The deposition of the High Priest was of course inconsistent with his general display of devotion to the Law. For the origin of the practice of changing the High Priest and its probable explanation see c. II. Appendix. That Herod himself was afraid of the effect of his action on public opinion is shown by *Antt.* XIX. vi. 3, where Josephus describes the remission of the house-tax in Jerusalem as a mark of Herod's gratitude to the nation for accepting his settlement of the High Priesthood without opposition.

18. Although a large part of Herod's policy was dictated by the necessity of conciliating the Pharisees, it is difficult to suppose that they were responsible for the persecution. S. James the Lord's brother, being himself a Pharisee, remains unaffected. It seems that it was rather due to the desire of the Sadducees to suppress the Church and at the same time to vindicate their zeal for the Law in the eyes of the nation and to find a victim for the general indignation excited by the

recent threat to the Temple. The nationalist extremists and the Sadducees, although in theory diametrically opposed, were in fact at a later stage united in an alliance based on the willingness of the High Priests to use the more criminal elements of the nationalist party for their own ends, and the power of the latter to intimidate the Sadducees. This coalition appears in Acts xxiii. 12, where the conspirators who offer to assist the High Priest in getting rid of S. Paul, when the Pharisees support him, are clearly of the zealot faction. It seems probable that the murder of S. James the Lord's brother by the High Priest Annas the younger was due to a similar combination of the Sadducees and the zealots against the Church, and incidentally the Pharisees (cf. c. III. § ii. n. 36). Albinus, the procurator, on hearing of the murder from the Pharisees, proceeds to depose Annas, and attempts to suppress the *sicarii*; his attempt to do so however fails, since Ananias, the former High Priest, is intimidated by them through the kidnapping of some of his relatives, and is compelled to secure the release of the leaders captured by Albinus. The position would seem to be that the Sadducees, having begun by consenting to use the zealot extremists for their own purposes, are now practically in their power (cf. also § iii. n. 6).

That the zealots should oppose the Church was only natural. Christianity definitely refused to work for a violent establishment of the Messianic kingdom, as the warnings against false Messiahs in the Gospels show (Mk xiii. 6, and note the extended version of the warning in Mt. xxiv. 10 and 25). It is probable that the Christians suffered on the occasion of the first rebellion as they did on the occasion of the second (Justin, *Apol.* i. 31).

[It may be observed that Schürer (*G.J.V.* I. 553 *seqq.*) over-emphasizes the extent to which Herod's policy was dictated by the Pharisees. It was necessary to conciliate them, since they were still the dominant force in Jewish politics. None the less their power was being undermined by the zealot movement, except in so far as they were willing to comply with it. Herod had also to conciliate the Sadducees and, so far as possible, the zealots, and it seems probable that the persecution was part of his attempt to conciliate the latter groups. Moreover, it would seem natural to suppose that the Pharisees, if they had favoured the persecution, would have desired to have the Apostles referred to the Sanhedrin on a charge of blasphemy, and put to death by stoning. Execution by the sword was only applicable to murderers and the people of an idolatrous city, in cases where the condemnation proceeded from the Sanhedrin (*Tr. San. M.* ix, x). The punishment in this case was clearly inflicted by Herod in virtue of his royal power, whereas, if he had been acting in the interests of the Pharisees, he should properly have handed the Christian leaders over to the Sanhedrin. Naturally Josephus and the rabbinical writers represent him as acting continually in accordance with the rulings of the Pharisees; he was certainly a popular figure and the Pharisees of a later time could not afford to admit that such popularity could be won by a ruler who was not entirely in their hands. No doubt he was successful in attempting to conciliate them; but the incident of *Antt.* XIX. vii. 4 shows that his attempts to conciliate his Gentile subjects alienated the stricter elements among the Pharisees.]

19. It is difficult to suppose that only S. James the son of Zebedee and S. Peter out of all the Twelve came to Jerusalem for the Passover; it is almost certain that normally all would be present. Any failure on their part to do so would be regarded as a grave act of impiety by the Hebrew Christians, and they would themselves take a similar view. The explanation seems to be that Herod was persuaded to strike at the Church as soon as he arrived and thus arrested S. James and put him to death in time for the remainder of the Twelve to be warned by the Christians of Jerusalem not to come up to the city for the feast. S. Peter presumably came soon after S. James and had not time to receive a warning, or else as chief of the Twelve felt it his duty to come in spite of the danger. Hence the persecution as a general attempt to suppress the Church was a complete failure.

20. Cf. c. I. n. 28. Clearly the house was a regular meeting-place, where S. Peter was likely to find some of the leading Christians. It is probable that he expected to find S. James the Lord's brother there.

21. This seems to be the implication of Acts xii. 17. S. James has not hitherto appeared in the narrative, but from this point onwards he appears as the more or

less recognized ruler of the Church in Jerusalem. It is clear from Gal. i. 19 that in fact he was already the most prominent person among the Christians of Jerusalem and practically regarded as an Apostle. It would seem that S. Luke intends his readers to understand that, whatever his actual position may have been before this time, his recognized accession to the position of ruler in the Church of Jerusalem dates from the message of S. Peter. This account of the matter is in itself probable; it is quite possible that S. Luke intends S. Peter's message to be interpreted as a formal commission to S. James to take over the government in view of his departure. This, however, can only be conjectured.

22. c. III. § ii *ad fin.*

23. It is clear that if S. Luke is right in dating the formal appointment of S. James the Lord's brother to S. Peter's departure from Jerusalem, he did in fact form the twelfth person who could be called in the fullest sense an Apostle (see Appendix on the Apostolate), since the death of S. James the son of Zebedee had left a vacancy.

24. He would normally have done so in an affair of such importance, as is clear from Acts i. 21 and vi. 2 *seqq.*

25. c. III. § ii. n. 36.

26. The fact that S. James only becomes the recognized ruler of the Church in Jerusalem at this point, when there is a vacancy in the ranks of the Twelve, and that he is from this point onwards the sole Apostle of the city, while the rest of the Twelve normally work in pairs (see Appendix on the Apostolate), suggests that the older Apostles regarded him henceforth as one of themselves, but supposed that they could not appoint him a colleague of equal rank since the number of Twelve was completed by his appointment (cf. Acts i. 21). This explains his "monarchical" position in Jerusalem, which is otherwise difficult to understand.

27. For the weakness of the police at the disposal of the Sanhedrin cf. c. II. n. 45. Herod had better forces at his disposal, since he had taken over the old garrison of the procurator (*G.J.V.* I. 460). None the less he might well hesitate before employing these forces in Judaea, since they were of Gentile or Samaritan origin, and thoroughly hostile to the Jews (c. IV. § ii. n. 6). The use of these troops in Judaea for the suppression of Christianity would probably have led to incidents similar to those recorded by Josephus (see note referred to above), and might well have ruined Herod's attempts to conciliate the nation. It may be observed that on the death of Herod, Fadus, the procurator, found the country in a thoroughly unsettled condition (*Antt.* XX. i. 1), a fact which was probably due to Herod's unwillingness to use the auxiliary forces of Gentile origin for the suppression of disturbances and brigandage in Judaea, and to the inefficiency of the Jewish police system, when the Gentile auxiliaries were not employed.

28. Cf. c. II. n. 44. There seems no reason for supposing that Herod succeeded to the wider powers of his grandfather.

29. The view that the visit of S. Peter to Antioch recorded in Gal. ii took place at this time involves a complete misunderstanding of the whole course of events (see below, § iv. n. 8). The supposition that he went to Rome on this occasion, at a moment when the possibility of the existence of the Church outside Judaea was scarcely envisaged by any but the Christians of Antioch, hardly needs discussion. For a full consideration of the history of S. Peter's movements cf. Chase in Hastings' *D.B.* iii. 756 *seqq.*, Art. "Peter (Simon)." It would be entirely unnecessary for him to do more than retire to a distance of some thirty miles from Jerusalem and avoid any undue publicity.

30. The first mention of the presbyters of the Church in Jerusalem occurs in Acts xi. 30. This mention of them precedes the departure of S. Peter from Jerusalem, but refers to a date which succeeds it. It is clearly impossible to suppose that SS. Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem at the beginning of the reign of Herod, and remained there until the end of it, a view which we should be compelled to follow if the order of S. Luke's narrative be regarded as strictly chronological. In fact, however, S. Luke frequently deserts the chronological for the logical order. Cf. above, c. IV. § i. n. 68, for evidence that he has done so in describing the arrival of the first missionaries at Antioch. A clearer instance may be found in the passage xviii. 23–xix. 1, where he takes S. Paul from Ephesus to Jerusalem and thence to

Antioch and the Galatian country and Phrygia (*i.e.* nearly back to Ephesus), before introducing the narrative of the conversion of Apollos at Ephesus during S. Paul's absence on the journeyings just recorded.

Of the institution of the presbyters there is no direct mention in the Acts. They appear, however, to have been in existence at the time of the visit of SS. Paul and Barnabas, and they are a recognized body almost equal in importance to the Apostles in Acts xv. 4, 6, 22 and 23, and xxi. 18. It can hardly be a mere coincidence that their appearance synchronizes with the persecution of Herod and the enforced abandonment by the Apostles of the practice of making Jerusalem their headquarters. The prospect of their permanent withdrawal during the lifetime of Herod (who was only fifty-one years of age at the time of his accession) would naturally lead to the appointment, for the reasons suggested in the text, of a body of assistants to share with S. James the Lord's brother the supervision of the Church in Jerusalem. The fact that they appear at this moment seems to justify the inference that they were appointed on this occasion, and for the reasons given. For the reasons for which S. Luke does not mention their appointment see the following notes.

31. An appearance of Our Lord to a number of Christians, who in virtue of this appearance and their ability to testify to the life and Resurrection of Our Lord are called "Apostles," is implied in the narrative of 1 Cor. xv. 7, where an appearance to "all the Apostles" is mentioned as distinct from the appearance to "the Twelve" in *v.* 5. For the sense in which S. Paul uses the title see Appendix on the Apostolate. It is not necessary to assume that all the presbyters had seen Our Lord after His Resurrection, or that they were regarded as "Apostles" in the wider sense; but it is natural to suppose that the first presbyters should be chosen by preference from among the number of those who had seen Our Lord and received some command to preach in His name. That there were men so qualified among the Christians of Jerusalem seems to be clearly implied in the Pauline narrative, which presupposes a body of Christians at Jerusalem, who were regarded as having a definite claim to authority in the Church on the strength of having been witnesses of the Resurrection.

32. c. III. § ii. n. 32.

33. The Sanhedrin numbered seventy members, being in theory the council of seventy appointed by Moses in Numbers xi. 16 (cf. *Tr. San. M.* i. 6). In *Antt.* xx. viii. 11 we find evidence of a supreme executive of the Sanhedrin with twelve members. Schürer ascribes this to Greek influence (*G.J.V.* II. 253), but in view of the Jewish practice of associating a smaller body of twelve and a larger council of seventy this seems unnecessary. Thus in Numbers i. 5 *seqq.* we have a council of twelve, one for each tribe. We find a similar association of bodies of twelve and seventy in *Vita* 11. On assuming command in Galilee Josephus appoints a council of seventy elders (*B.J.* II. xx. 5). He has just described the divisions of the commands throughout the country. He mentions nine persons in charge of various districts, including Jerusalem, and notes that Eleazar, the son of Simon, was not put in command of Jerusalem. His language is ambiguous, since it is not clear whether he means that he was made subordinate to Joseph, son of Gorion, and the High Priest Ananus, or simply that he was not put in sole command, but only their equal. He has of course motives of personal hostility for depreciating the position of Eleazar. Similarly he mentions that Niger of Peraea, who was at the outbreak of the war in command in Idumea, was not left in command, but was ordered to obey two commanders sent from Jerusalem. But in III. ii. 2 Niger and another officer, Silas of Babylon, appear as the equals of John the Essene, one of the nine officers named in the earlier passage. It seems not unlikely therefore that the original division of commands in fact allowed for a college of twelve, which on Jewish precedents we should naturally expect. For other councils of seventy cf. *B.J.* IV. v. 4 and the council of seventy at Alexandria (*G.J.V.* II. 249).

Thus it would be natural on *a priori* grounds to suppose that the first college of Christian presbyters would number seventy members. This probability receives strong confirmation from the account of the mission of the seventy by Our Lord in Lk. x. No such mission is mentioned by the other evangelists. On the other hand S. Luke makes no reference to the appointment of the presbyters of Jerusalem. They appear at the time of the Herodian persecution, and not previously; but when they appear it seems to be assumed that they have been existing from the

outset. The explanation seems to be that S. Luke, having visited Jerusalem and found there a college of seventy presbyters, some of whom at least had been witnesses of Our Lord's earthly ministry, and had perhaps received some kind of command to preach the Gospel, has attributed to Him the original appointment of a college of seventy, whom he supposes to have been the original seventy presbyters. It must be remembered that in point of fact the absences of the Apostles from Jerusalem during the five years which passed between the martyrdom of S. Stephen and the Herodian persecution would necessitate the employment of older converts to perform their duties, such as instructing new converts, presiding at the Eucharist and other meetings for Christian worship, preaching and the like. Of such older converts those would naturally be preferred who were witnesses of the ministry of Our Lord and His Resurrection. On the other hand the silence of the other Synoptists, and the fact that the presbyters only appear as a formally recognized body some twelve years after the Crucifixion, are almost fatal to the supposition that they were in fact originally appointed by Our Lord. It is, of course, conceivable that He did on some occasion make use of a body of seventy disciples, but it is remarkable, if so, that neither S. Matthew nor S. Mark records the fact.

On the other hand it would seem that the informant from whom S. Luke has derived the narrative of the earlier portion of the Acts has taken the existence of the presbyters at Jerusalem for granted, and given him no definite information as to the occasion or method of their appointment. Hence S. Luke, knowing that many of them were, at least in the first instance, eyewitnesses of the ministry of Our Lord, ascribes their appointment to Him. None the less this source of information has preserved accurately the date of their institution, and does not introduce them until the moment when they passed from the status of an unorganized body of older disciples, on whom the Twelve could depend for the confirmation of their teaching, into the position of a recognized college of elders appointed to advise and assist the Apostle of Jerusalem. The fact that they appear at this point and not before testifies rather strongly to the accuracy of the source of S. Luke's information here.

It may be added that S. James as a Pharisee would naturally be inclined to regard seventy as the inevitable number for such a college.

With regard to the variant ἑβδομήκοντα δύο in Lk. x. 1, it may be noted that the confusion between seventy and seventy-two is common in Jewish literature of the period. This is due to the fact that the latter number allows for six representatives from each tribe. So in Exod. xxiv. 1, 9 we find in addition to Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu and seventy elders. On the other hand in Numbers xi. 16 we find only Moses and seventy elders, but presumably Aaron should be added, making seventy-two in all. In the Sanhedrin there were seventy members and the High Priest as president; but it may be presumed that ideally the king should also be present, making seventy-two (cf. *Tr. San. M.* ii. 4, where the seventy-one are the Sanhedrin and the president, who was in fact at this period the High Priest). The Jewish academy at Jamnia in the second century had seventy-two members (*G.J.V.* II. 249), although professing to be the successor of the Sanhedrin. Similarly, in *Ps. Arist.* 32, the translators of the Jewish Scriptures are to number seventy-two, six from each tribe, as in *Antt.* XII. ii. 6; but in § 7 of the same chapter Josephus describes them as the seventy elders. Cf. also 1 En. lxxxix. 59, where there are seventy shepherds, whereas in xc. 1 some versions represent the half of them as thirty-six.

34. Cf. *G.J.V.* II. 250 for the use of this procedure as a form of admission of members co-opted to the Sanhedrin.

35. Cf. c. II. n. 44. The Sanhedrin claimed complete authority over all members of the nation, and it is probable that Jews throughout the world admitted that authority in theory, although it was not an actual fact, and never had been. None the less its prestige was a factor of the highest importance in the Jewish world, and the new Christian Sanhedrin could hardly fail to enjoy a somewhat similar prestige among Jewish Christians throughout the world; and except in Samaria and Antioch the number of non-Jewish Christians was negligible. Further, it was the only organized government of its kind in existence, and thus the Church of Jerusalem was alone in its power to express a corporate opinion—an advantage of the utmost value.

§ iii. THE FAMINE AND THE FIRST CONCORDAT

For the period of Herod's reign in Judaea the re-organization of the Church and the danger of a recurrence of the persecution prevented the Christians of Jerusalem from exercising any influence on the development of the mixed communities of Jews and Gentiles which were growing up in and around Antioch. Saul was able to continue his work in that city and to resume and extend his labours in Cilicia without interference[1]. For a period of nine years from his departure from Jerusalem he preached the Gospel[2], not only in Antioch and that part of Cilicia which was attached to the province of Syria, but also in the regions subject to the two monarchs Antiochus of Commagene and Polemon of Cilicia, who were permitted by the Imperial government to rule the less civilized portions of the country[3]. In these regions he met with a considerable measure of persecution, and was subjected to indignities from which as a Roman citizen he should have been exempt[4]. For the whole period he exercised partly at Antioch and partly in his native land an Apostolate similar to that which the Twelve were exercising in the various regions of Palestine[5].

Herod however died in A.D. 44, and the manner of his death was regarded by the Jews as a signal instance of retribution for his presumption in accepting the divine honours offered to him by his Syrian subjects. It was natural also that the Church should see in it the just reward for his persecution. Judaea reverted to its former status as a province of the Empire, subject to a procurator of its own. The new ruler, Cuspius Fadus, showed no signs of favouring those elements in the country which constituted the chief danger to the Church. The more violent forms of nationalism were sternly repressed, while the Jewish rulers were faced with a demand for the restoration to Roman custody of the High Priest's robes of office. The demand excited so much opposition that it was necessary for Cassius Longinus, the legate of Syria, to march with his legions into Judaea. The danger of war was however averted by the intervention of Herod of Chalcis, brother of the late king, who supported the protest of the Jewish ambassadors sent to Claudius to oppose the demand of the procurator; he obtained for his countrymen the control of the sacred garments, while he himself received jurisdiction over the Temple and the right to nominate the High Priest[6]. The unfriendly attitude of Fadus to the Jewish rulers removed the obstacle which had hitherto prevented the Twelve from visiting Jerusalem.

By this time however the new method of government was sufficiently established in the local Church to prevent any attempt at reverting to the old state of affairs. The presbyters under the rule of James the Lord's brother remained supreme in local matters, and were able to exercise a considerable degree of influence on the Twelve. The latter remained in name the rulers of the whole Christian society in Judaea and elsewhere, but they could not afford to ignore the opinion of the oldest and strongest centre of Christianity[7].

Fadus was replaced by Tiberius Alexander, a member of one of the leading Jewish families of Alexandria, and a ruler of far higher quality than the ordinary procurators of Judaea. He was however a renegade from the religion of his nation[8]. He was therefore not likely to countenance a religious persecution, and the Church could hope for a further period of security. Meanwhile, however, the disaster foretold by Agabus six years before was at hand. The intrusion of the abomination of desolation into the holy place had indeed been averted for the moment, and was still being kept back by some mysterious force; but one of the signs of the coming end of all things made its appearance[9]. A period of scarcity over a considerable part of the world developed in A.D. 48, at least in Judaea, into a regular famine[10]. In Jerusalem it made itself felt with the utmost severity, as was natural in a city which had to support, not only its proper inhabitants, but also the vast number of devotees who had migrated thither out of motives of piety, and were at all times largely dependent for their maintenance on the charity of others. The distress was alleviated, so far as the orthodox Jews were concerned, by the munificence of Helena, Queen of Adiabene, and her son, Izates, recent converts to the Jewish faith; but the hostility of the rulers of the city was likely to prevent her bounty from reaching the Christians[11].

In any case the time had come for the Christians of Antioch to use the funds which they had been collecting for some time past with a view to the emergency. The relief was entrusted to the two Apostles of Antioch. To choose representatives of less eminence would have been an insult to the Mother-Church; and none could be more willing than they to perform it. Saul had the utmost admiration for the evangelical poverty of Jerusalem[12]; while Barnabas had been one of those converts who in the first enthusiasm of the movement had surrendered all their worldly wealth in order to join "the Poor." Saul indeed might have felt some difficulty, since he had been commanded by a divine revelation to leave the city rather than to expose

his life to danger by remaining there. There was no reason to suppose that his old enemies the Hellenist Jews would not renew their efforts to destroy him in the event of his return. The previous command however was withdrawn by a fresh vision, which ordered him to go up to the city[13]. The mission accordingly made its way to Jerusalem and handed over the relief to the presbyters, on whom the duty of providing for the necessitous members of the Church had devolved, along with the other functions of government[14]. It was only natural that the two Apostles should be accompanied by some of the Antiochene converts, who could both assist them in their task and also demonstrate the good will of the younger society to the Mother-Church. At this point, however, Saul and Barnabas made a somewhat serious error. Under-estimating the influence of the element at Jerusalem which was utterly opposed to the admission to the Church of Gentiles who were not willing to become proselytes of Judaism, they took with them an uncircumcised convert of Antioch named Titus. His inclusion in the party might well seem a gracious way of demonstrating the solidarity of Gentile and Jewish Christians[15].

On their arrival they found in Jerusalem not only James, but also Peter and John, who naturally felt bound to be in the city in the hour of its need. The exact course of events during the visit is obscured by the confusion of the only narrative of them which has come down to us, a confusion due to the embitterment which arose between the Antiochene leaders and the Hebrew Christians. Consequently, in many points, we are compelled to make use of conjecture to supplement the narrative. The moment favoured a solution of the old controversy as to the position of Gentile converts towards the Law, since it might well be difficult to find so good an opportunity for a discussion between the leaders of the older body and the teachers of the newer point of view. Accordingly Saul laid before the Apostles whom he found in the city the whole of his system of teaching on this matter. This was that the Law, having proved a failure in practice in so far as the actual production of righteousness was concerned, was to be regarded as a merely temporary and partial revelation, intended to prepare men for the full revelation given by Jesus. At baptism the believer received from Him a new power to overcome temptation and to realize that righteousness, which the Law had held up as an ideal before the eyes of men, while giving them no power to achieve it. Hence, so far as the Gentiles were concerned, the Law was no longer binding. Since however he had not actually heard the

teaching given by Jesus during His life on earth, Saul offered to revise his system, if it could be shown that it was contrary to that revealed by the Founder of the Church[16].

The conference was interrupted by an incident which threatened to produce the gravest consequences. The fact that Titus was not circumcised, although known to the rulers of the Christian community, had not been made generally public. The suspicions of some of the members of the Church were however excited, and their inquiries, conducted in a manner which Saul regarded as utterly unjustifiable and dishonourable, led to the discovery of the truth[17]. Although the Hebrew Christians had been unable to prevent the baptism of uncircumcised Gentiles at Antioch, they were by no means prepared to tolerate their appearance in the Holy City as the equals of Jewish Christians, nor were they prepared to incur defilement by eating with them at the common meals of the Church[18]. Quite apart from their own horror at the thought of doing so, they would be exposed to serious personal danger if it were generally known in Jerusalem that such breaches of the Law were regarded as a matter of indifference by the Church. Naturally they raised a vigorous demand that Titus should be circumcised.

Saul opposed the demand with equal vigour. He found however to his disgust that the recognized rulers of the Church, although they might be disposed to sympathise with his views, were entirely unable to over-ride the demands of their followers. As an expert in the Law he could only regard with contempt the zeal of those who thought that there was any value in selecting a few particular ordinances for special veneration, while ignoring the rest. He was further in the habit of claiming from his own followers an absolute obedience, which they had hitherto been prepared to render to one who had been the means of bringing them to the knowledge of the truth. The position was however different at Jerusalem, where many had learnt their faith from the Lord Himself, and where the Church was organized in such a way as to permit others besides the Apostles to express the corporate opinion of the society. Saul, in spite of his indignant opposition, had no choice but to yield to the demands of the Hebrews; he was persuaded to allow one of his most prominent Gentile converts to be circumcised for the sake of preserving the unity of the Christian society. His defeat naturally filled him with the deepest indignation, and considerably diminished his respect for the reputed leaders of the Church, who had shown themselves incapable of exercising any effective control over their followers[19].

None the less in spite of his defeat in the particular case of Titus he was able to carry his main point. The older Apostles were entirely ready to make amends for their failure to support him in practice by concessions on the matter of principle. It was agreed that Barnabas and Saul should be allowed a free hand in their dealings with Gentile converts, and consequently that their proceedings at Antioch should be regarded as enjoying the full sanction of the Church. In return it was to be understood that the Gentiles were morally bound to support the Mother-Church in its poverty by their alms, as they had already shown themselves willing to do. They would thus testify their loyalty to the Church from which they had learnt the faith, and their adherence to the doctrines which it taught, and also their admiration for that ideal of poverty, which was realized in practice at Jerusalem, though impracticable elsewhere. Their generosity would render it difficult for the Christians of Jerusalem to raise any very effective demand for the circumcision of all Christians, while the latter would benefit by the prayers and piety of those who had made a far greater progress in Christian holiness than the ordinary Gentile convert was normally able to do[20].

The agreement, although apparently satisfactory, contained in itself two serious elements of weakness. In the first place it rested only on the personal acceptance of the new attitude to the Law by three of the older Apostles. The Hebrew Christians had on previous occasions refused to accept Peter's authority as final; and although in the present case he was supported by two of his most important colleagues, it was probable, if not certain, that in a matter on which feeling ran so high the rest of the Church of Jerusalem would refuse to accept any private decision, and would claim the right to make their voice heard[21]. In the second place the agreement was ambiguous. Barnabas and Saul were free to act as they saw fit in dealing with Gentile converts. But the difficulty lay not merely in the question of the position of Gentile converts, but in the question of their relation to Jewish Christians in communities composed both of Jews and of Gentiles, where it was impossible for the two elements in the Church to meet on a footing of equality without a breach of the Law on the part of the Jews. Since the only method of approaching the Gentiles in the first instance lay in appealing to those who were in touch with the synagogues, and since in any case the Jews had a right to hear the Gospel first, it was morally certain that any community which owed its origin to the labours of Barnabas and Saul would be of this mixed kind[22].

The vagueness was due to the fact that there seemed no reason to anticipate the rise of any large number of communities of this sort[23]. In any case they would be outside Judaea, and it might be hoped that the Hebrews would raise no objection, so long as no more Gentiles appeared in Jerusalem. It is possible—though here we can only venture a conjecture—that it was as a visible pledge of the agreement that Peter arranged to visit Antioch shortly afterwards. Such a visit might demonstrate the unity of all Christians and the gratitude of the older converts for the assistance received from the younger community[24]. With success, as it was hoped, finally achieved, Barnabas and Saul returned to Antioch, taking with them John Mark, a nephew of the latter. Although a Hellenist by origin, he had hitherto been content to accept the views of the Gospel current in Jerusalem. None the less his familiarity with the first followers of Jesus made him a valuable helper in the task of preaching to the Gentiles. Saul in particular had but little knowledge of the historical details of the life of the Founder of Christianity, and could hardly fail to feel at times the need of an assistant who could supply his own deficiencies in this respect[25].

NOTES TO CHAPTER V, SECTION III

1. The failure of the Hebrew Christians to take any effective action to follow up their campaign against the admission of the Gentiles is very remarkable. It would seem that the necessary re-organization of the Church in face of Herod's persecution and the subsequent famine occupied their attention to the exclusion of any interest in the affairs of Antioch. It must be remembered that the right of the Church of Jerusalem, as apart from the Apostles, to intervene in the matter was open to considerable doubt (see above, § i. n. 11). It was only when the new rulers of the Hebrews had gained considerably in confidence that they ventured to repeat the experiment of sending emissaries to Antioch to advocate their views on the subject of circumcision (Acts xv).

2. S. Luke, with his usual disregard for the movements of his characters when they are not on the main scene of action, brings S. Paul from Cilicia to Antioch in Acts xi. 26, after some two years at Tarsus (§ i. n. 1). Here he works for a year, which ends with the arrival of Agabus. He is then left, apparently at Antioch, until the time of his visit to Jerusalem, his return from Jerusalem to Antioch occurring at some unspecified time after the death of Herod in A.D. 44. As a matter of fact the visit to Jerusalem at the time of the famine does not occur until A.D. 48, or fourteen years after his conversion (see n. 14). It would be natural to suppose that he remained in Antioch during the intervening period, were it not for the fact that in Gal. i. 21 he describes this period as having been spent in the *κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας*. The language can only mean that his time was divided between the two districts of Syria proper and Cilicia; he would hardly mention Cilicia, if his ministry had been confined to Antioch apart from the year or so which he passed at Tarsus before he was invited by S. Barnabas to assist in the work at the former city.

This view is confirmed by the extraordinary differences between S. Paul's adventures as recorded in the Acts and the list of his sufferings in 2 Cor. xi. 24 *seqq.* S. Luke can have no motive for ignoring his persecutions and sufferings, except where they might involve an adverse decision by an authoritative Imperial court;

in other cases he would naturally tend to record them, as likely to increase the respect for S. Paul among his Christian readers. In particular three shipwrecks in the very few voyages recorded in the Acts, prior to the residence at Ephesus during which this letter was written, are incredible. Those voyages number seven (Seleucia—Salamis, Paphos—Perga, Perga—Antioch, Troas—Neapolis (where a shipwreck, had it occurred, would certainly have been recorded), Beroea—Athens (possibly), Corinth—Ephesus, Ephesus—Jerusalem). It is out of the question to suppose that S. Paul was shipwrecked on one in every two voyages he undertook, and that all these were ignored entirely by the compiler of the Acts. (Probably a voyage from Ephesus to Corinth and back should be added: but even so the proportion of wrecks is far too high.)

The inference is that these years were spent by S. Paul partly in Antioch and partly in Cilicia proper. It would be natural for him to use the sea for travelling between Tarsus and Antioch, and three shipwrecks become conceivable.

3. Ramsay supposes S. Paul's labours to have been confined to the Roman portion of Cilicia, *i.e.* the region of *Cilicia Campestris* which was in the province of Syria. For this view he offers no evidence, and the evidence available tells against it. In the first place the whole route travelled on the "first missionary journey" is meaningless unless the Apostles originally intended to travel on from Derbe overland to Tarsus and thence to Antioch. Their failure to accomplish this plan was due to the fact that they had been compelled to leave the communities of "Galatia" in haste owing to the opposition they had excited; but the change of plan would hardly be possible, if the cities lying between Derbe and Tarsus (*i.e.* the urban centres not the rural districts) were not yet evangelized. There would have been no reason for S. Paul to wait at Derbe, as he apparently did, instead of going on to Laranda (admitted by Ramsay to have been probably larger than Derbe), and thence continuing his journey overland to Tarsus and returning to the Pisidian Antioch, if these regions were without Churches. On the other hand, if Churches had been established on the road from Tarsus to Ephesus as far as Laranda, it becomes possible to understand the delay at Derbe and the return to the Pisidian Antioch, and also the fact that these Churches are described in Acts xv. 23 as being in "Cilicia" (see below, c. vi. § i. n. 4). Naturally Churches would only be established in towns of some size. (Ramsay's interpretation of the wording of Gal. i. 21 in *Hist. Comm. on Gal.* 278 is unconvincing. It seems very doubtful whether S. Paul uses the word κλίματα in any more definite sense than he does in Ro. xv. 23, where the word is used apparently as a general description of the whole area evangelized by him between the Syrian Antioch and Corinth.) Cf. also 2 Cor. xi. 10.

Although the towns in the kingdoms of Antiochus of Commagene and Polemon (for these two monarchs cf. *G.J.V.* i. 557 *seqq.*) were not of first-rate importance, it is clear that S. Paul at this stage of his career had not seen the advantage of concentrating his efforts on the large provincial centres, and thought it necessary to evangelize every town through which he passed, or at least any town large enough to contain a Jewish settlement (see below, c. vi. § iii. n. 17 and § v. n. 2). Of such towns there were several besides Laranda in the kingdom of Antiochus. One of his ports, Anemurium, was wealthy enough to attract the attention of the freebooters from the hills (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 55); a Jew of Anemurium appears in an epitaph at Corycus where other Jewish epitaphs are also found; for these and others from Olba and Seleucia in the same region cf. *G.J.V.* iii. 22 and 717. The two monarchs were present at the conference of Eastern dynasts held by Herod at Tiberias (*Antt.* xix. viii. 1), and Polemon after Herod's death agreed to be circumcised in order to obtain the hand of Bernice. Antiochus agreed to do the same for the sake of Drusilla, but subsequently withdrew (*Antt.* xx. vii. 1, 3). It is only reasonable to suppose that Herod's attempts to encourage solidarity among the Eastern dynasts were accompanied by a considerable trading connection between Judaea and the neighbouring kingdoms.

4. This is the natural explanation of the three "beatings with rods" recorded in 2 Cor. xi. 25. In Acts xvi. 37 and xxii. 25 S. Paul protests against the indignity with the utmost vigour, and unless the narrative of Acts is hopelessly defective it is difficult to fit in the other two occasions. On the other hand the subordinates of

the subject-princes of the Empire would probably not be very careful to respect S. Paul's rights. He could only obtain redress against such rulers by appealing to the legate of Syria, who again could do little without appealing to Rome in a matter of this kind. Consequently S. Paul could do nothing if his claims as a Roman citizen were ignored, unless he was prepared to postpone his missionary activities for the whole of the period which would be absorbed by an appeal to Rome; and that period might well prove a long one. It should be remembered that these two princes, by attending Herod's conference, showed what Marsus, the legate of Syria, regarded as signs of undue independence; and their subordinates would soon be affected by their tone. For the territories of these monarchs cf. Hill in Hastings' *D.B.* II. 86, Art. "Galatia."

5. Cf. c. III. § ii. The length of time spent by S. Paul in Syria and Cilicia seems to indicate that he contemplated working there at least until he had established Churches on a permanent footing in the leading towns. Although the area of his labours was very large as compared with Judaea, Galilee and Samaria, which divided the attentions of the Twelve, it must be remembered that in these regions the whole Jewish population had to be evangelized, whereas in S. Paul's area only the towns with a Jewish population came into consideration.

Whether S. Barnabas assisted him outside Antioch is not clear; but since he is not mentioned in Gal. i. 21, and since S. Paul, who is subordinate to S. Barnabas in Acts xiii. 1 and 7, takes the lead in *v.* 16, where the work becomes an extension of the previously existing Cilician sphere of activity, it is probable that he did not, but confined his labours to Antioch and the Phoenician cities.

6. For Fadus' administration cf. *Antt.* XX. i. His actions were, it would seem, the inevitable result of Herod's policy as described in § ii. n. 18. It may be noted as confirming the view there advanced as to the complicity of the Sadducean class with the zealots that the actions of Fadus are directed against both. On the other hand, although the Pharisees were opposed no less than the Sadducees to the demand that the robes of the High Priest should be left in charge of the procurator, yet Josephus speaks with high praise of the administration of Fadus.

7. The fact that the rulers of Jerusalem were not on good terms with Fadus would make it easy for the Twelve to visit Jerusalem, since he would be unlikely to agree to a persecution, and seems to have been too firm a ruler to permit anything in the nature of mob-violence. The same applies to his successor Tiberius Alexander (see n. 8). Hence in Gal. ii the Apostles use Jerusalem freely. At the same time the arrangements made in A.D. 41, when there was every reason to suppose that they would be unable to return during the lifetime of Herod, remained in force. This fact confirms the view that the persecution of Herod falls at the beginning of his reign, since it would have been natural to revert to the old state of affairs if the death of Herod had occurred soon after the persecution and before the new system of government by S. James and the presbyters was firmly established (cf. § ii. n. 30, and n. 1 above).

8. The date of Fadus' replacement by Tiberius Alexander can only be conjectured. The two periods of office fall in the years A.D. 44–48, assuming that Josephus in *Antt.* XX. v. 2 is to be interpreted as meaning that the arrival of Cumanus to replace Tiberius Alexander coincided with the death of Herod of Chalcis in the eighth year of Claudius (cf. *G.J.V.* I. 568).

Tiberius Alexander was a son of Alexander, the alabarch, or ruler of the Jewish community in Alexandria, but was himself a renegade (*Antt. ib.*). It is of interest to observe that his father was a brother of Philo (*Antt.* XVIII. viii. 1). His later career was one of high distinction. In A.D. 63 he was on the staff of Corbulo in Armenia and a person of considerable importance (Tac. *Ann.* XV. 28). By A.D. 66 he had risen to be prefect of Egypt, the highest post open to men of equestrian rank (*B.J.* II. xv. 1). He was still in office at the death of Nero (Tac. *Hist.* i. 11, where he is described as being of Egyptian origin; it is of interest to observe that Tacitus either ignores or is unaware of his Jewish descent); in this capacity he declared for Vespasian on July 1, A.D. 69, being the first provincial governor to do so (*ib.* ii. 79). He subsequently acted as chief of Titus' staff in Judaea (*B.J.* v. i. 6). Cf. also *G.J.V.* I. 568. His appointment to the post of procurator of Judaea is somewhat remarkable. He was obviously a man of unusual capacity, since a Jew

of Alexandria would hardly rise to such eminence, even at the cost of abandoning his religion, without very noticeable qualifications. On the other hand he is the only procurator of Judaea during the period preceding the rebellion who is known to have been a person of any importance, and it is difficult to explain his appearance in this capacity. Moreover it is difficult to explain the appointment to the post by Claudius of a Jew who had abandoned his religion and would therefore seem likely to be even more unacceptable to the Jews than a procurator of purely Gentile origin. It is perhaps worth noticing that the famine, according to *Antt.* XX. v. 2, fell partly under Fadus and partly under Alexander. It is tempting to conjecture that the rather peculiar appointment was due to the emergency of the famine, and that Tiberius Alexander was appointed as a specially competent officer to cope with the distress which the famine had produced. In this case it is likely that he held office only for a short period towards the end of the famine, and that the execution of the sons of Judas of Galilee, recorded by Josephus (*loc. cit.*), was simply an incidental detail (the only one of note) in his career in Judaea. (Naturally the famine would be likely to provoke Messianic agitation.)

In any case he would not be likely to show much sympathy with any attempt to persecute the Church.

9. Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 3 *seqq.* In this mysterious passage there is a quite obvious allusion to the attempt of Caligula to desecrate the Temple. Since, however, the letter if genuine cannot have been written before A.D. 51 (naturally, if it be a forgery, it cannot be earlier and may be considerably later), it is difficult to understand the allusion to an event which occurred some ten years earlier. If, however, the view of the events of this period given in § ii. n. 6 be correct this point is easy to understand. The fact that there was a general expectation of the end in Christian and Jewish circles in consequence of Caligula's proposals, and that his plans, and with them the end of all things, had failed to materialize, would demand some explanation; and the memory of the incident would be kept fresh by the occurrence of another sign in the form of the famine. Thus the passage is a fragment of an apocalypse or prophecy intended to explain the delay in the end foretold by the earlier prophecy. The nature of the force which restrained the "man of lawlessness" in 2 Thess. ii. 6 can only be conjectured. The fact that the passage is a quotation from current Christian apocalyptic is no argument against the Pauline authorship of the letter. S. Paul is perfectly capable of unacknowledged quotations, and the quotation may be from a "prophecy" of his own. It is quite possible that the "mystery" of 1 Cor. xv. 51 and the "word of the Lord" in 1 Thess. iv. 15 are similar quotations by S. Paul either from his own prophecies or those of others.

For possible indications of a belief in a return of Caligula, which seems to be indicated in 2 Thess. by the fact that he is only being restrained for the present, cf. Rev. xiii. 3 *seqq.*, and Charles' note *ad loc.* (I cannot accept Thackeray's view (*St Paul and Jewish Thought*, 140) that S. Paul has not in mind Caligula's attack on the sanctity of the Temple.)

10. For the famine cf. *Antt.* XX. v. 2, and see also III. xv. 3. From the fact that it is remembered by Josephus as "the great famine" and that it called for assistance on a large scale from Helena, Queen of Adiabene (*Antt.* XX. ii. 5), it seems clear that it must have been more than a purely local scarcity. Nor would the Antiochenes have felt that the time had come for their assistance unless it was possible to regard it as a serious famine from the point of view of the whole of the Eastern Levant. Suetonius records continual scarcities under Claudius (*Claud.* 18). S. Luke can hardly be expected to do more than reflect the opinion of Antioch as to the extent of the famine, and Schürer's criticism in *G.J.V.* I. 567 on Acts xi. 28 seems somewhat superfluous. S. Luke can hardly be expected to write with statistical accuracy.

The famine falls in the years A.D. 44–48, and if the conjecture advanced above as to the appointment of Tiberius Alexander be correct, it would seem to have reached its height towards the end of the period.

11. This can only be conjectured, but Helena, as a devout proselyte, would naturally distribute her relief through the Jewish authorities, *i.e.* the High Priest and his officers. It is at least probable that they would discriminate in favour of the orthodox Jews as against those known to be Christians. It is not certain however how far the ordinary Jewish Christians of Jerusalem would be definitely known as such.

12. Gal. ii. 10, 2 Cor. viii. 9 *seqq.*, and see below, n. 20.

13. Gal. ii. 2. The point of this verse is of course to prove that S. Paul's reason for the visit was not to inquire as to the orthodoxy of his teaching, but a direct divine command. The explanation of the vision given in the text is again only conjectural. Since, however, he had been ordered to leave the city by a vision (Acts xxii. 18, and cf. c. IV. § i. n. 62), it was only natural that he should need a fresh vision before he could return. For S. Paul's visions cf. also c. II. n. 48. In the present instance the vision might well arise from the conflict between his desire to go to Jerusalem as the emissary of Antioch and the belief that the vision which led to his departure still prevents him from returning.

14. The narrative of the text assumes that the second visit of S. Paul to Jerusalem, described in Gal. ii, is the visit paid on the occasion of the famine and not the visit for the Council of Jerusalem. It is quite clear that the narrative of the famine visit in Acts xi. 30 and xii. 25 cannot be intended to mean that the collection was made and sent to Jerusalem immediately after the prophecy. For the prophecy was made before the death of Caligula (§ ii. n. 6), and on this supposition it would follow that S. Paul arrived in Jerusalem at about the same time as Herod and remained there throughout the three years of his reign, only returning to Antioch after Herod's death. This view is out of the question and it follows that we must regard the narrative of the Acts as following a logical and not a chronological order.

In other words the journey of the two Apostles from Antioch to Jerusalem follows the death of Herod, and it is only natural to suppose that it occurred at the crisis of the famine in A.D. 47 or 48. The only serious objection to this view is the language of Gal. ii. 1, which would certainly be more naturally understood to mean that the second visit took place fourteen years after the first. On the other hand Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 1 admits the possibility of referring the period of fourteen years to the interval between S. Paul's conversion and this second visit to Jerusalem rather than to the interval between the two visits. In this case the date presents no difficulty, since the interval between S. Paul's conversion in the closing months of A.D. 35 or the opening months of A.D. 36, and a visit in the later months of A.D. 47 or the early months of A.D. 48 would be easily described as one of fourteen years.

Lightfoot's attempt to identify the visit of Gal. ii with the Council of Jerusalem without sacrificing the reliability either of Acts xv or Gal. ii is in any case hopeless. The contrast between the privacy of the discussion of Gal. ii and the publicity of the Council is fatal. Either we have different incidents or two contradictory accounts of the same incident, one of which is either utterly inaccurate or else deliberately falsified. S. Paul insists that he only consulted the leaders of the Church, while S. Luke insists that the whole body was consulted. Further Lightfoot's version of the whole affair assumes that the Council only marked the opening of the controversy as to the circumcision of the Gentiles, whereas S. Luke regards it as the close of the whole matter. The identification of the visit of Gal. ii with the Council of Jerusalem is really fatal to S. Luke's accuracy. It also involves S. Paul in deliberate perjury, since Gal. i. 20 is entirely unjustifiable if S. Paul is in fact suppressing all mention of a visit to Jerusalem at the time of the famine. His object is to prove that he did not learn his doctrines from men but by a direct revelation, and he is showing how little communication he had with the older Apostles. Lightfoot's argument that on the occasion of the famine he only saw the presbyters will not hold; for the presbyters were in many cases converts of long standing, who could speak with a very high degree of authority as witnesses of Our Lord's teaching. Nor, although the mission was sent to the presbyters as rulers of the Church in Jerusalem, is it possible to suppose that S. Paul on such a visit would not have met S. James, whom he regards as an Apostle. Thus if the visit of Gal. ii is the Council-visit, S. Paul, in spite of his solemn assertion in i. 20, is suppressing all mention of a meeting with him and the elders, which might have been of the utmost importance. If he had in fact paid a visit to Jerusalem during which the matter was not discussed, he could easily have said so.

The account of this incident and the course of the subsequent controversy given below avoids the whole conflict of evidence and the incomprehensible confusion involved in the view that the question of the circumcision of the Gentiles continued

to be a subject of debate after the Council. For a fuller discussion of the whole matter cf. *E.E.P.* pp. 282 *seqq.*

It is to be noted that the presbyters appear in Acts xi. 30 to be in charge of the temporal affairs of the Church in Jerusalem, a fact which shows fairly conclusively that the college of Seven had ceased to exist, unless it was simply concerned with the assistance of Hellenists. It is, however, hardly likely that the Hellenist section of the Church continued to exist after the death of Stephen. There would always be a few helpless dependents of the Church who were of Hellenist origin, but it seems unlikely that Hellenist Christians were numerous, or that they would form a distinct fraction of the Christian body.

15. The entrusting of the relief-collection to the two Apostles is in accordance with the general practice of the N.T. by which important communications are entrusted to Christians of high standing. Cf. Acts xv. 22, Ro. xvi. 1, where apparently Phoebe is the bearer of the letter, 2 Cor. ii. 13, viii. 18, Eph. vi. 21, 1 Pet. v. 12, and cf. § iv. n. 1. The practice was of course necessary in a civilization where communication was slow, since such envoys would normally have to be given wide discretionary powers for dealing with the situation that confronted them. Hence the sending of an important message by an envoy who was not of enough standing to undertake any action on his own responsibility would be regarded as a mark of disrespect. It seems natural to suppose that Titus was included as a Gentile convert of high standing for the reasons suggested in the text. Since, however, S. Paul had made no public announcement of the fact that he was uncircumcised, it would appear that on his arrival in Jerusalem he realized the opposition of the Hebrew Christians to the baptism of uncircumcised Gentiles, and thought it wiser to make no public statement on the point. It must be remembered that the prophets from Jerusalem had not raised the question of circumcision on their visit to Antioch.

16. For S. Paul's "Gospel" in so far as it concerned the question of the Law cf. c. IV. § i. nn. 25, 31. Gal. ii. 2 appears to mean that S. Paul would have been ready to change his attitude on this question if the older Apostles could have shown that it was contrary to the teaching of Our Lord.

17. It may be supposed that S. Paul would inform the three Apostles that Titus was uncircumcised, since he would have no reason for not doing so, but it is quite clear that he regarded the means by which others became aware of the fact as grossly dishonourable (Gal. ii. 4). The account of the incident given in the text is of course largely based on conjecture. The view that the discovery that Titus was uncircumcised was made and the demand for his circumcision raised in the middle of S. Paul's discussions with the older Apostles is, however, supported to some extent by the order of the narrative in Gal. ii. 4 *seqq.*, which suggests that S. Paul is narrating the events in question in the order in which they present themselves to his memory. This is of course by no means conclusive. On the other hand it becomes easier to explain the willingness of the older Apostles to give way to S. Paul on the general question of principle, if we suppose that S. Paul was compelled to give way on the practical question as to the circumcision of Titus.

18. Cf. above, c. IV. § ii. n. 10. The whole difficulty as to the relation of Jews and Gentiles within the Church turns on the fact that the common meal and the Eucharist were the distinctive element of Christian worship. The services of the synagogue were constantly attended by Gentiles, whose presence does not appear to have brought any defilement on the Jewish part of the congregation.

19. This is perhaps the most probable interpretation of the allusion to the incident of Titus in Gal. ii. It is difficult to suppose that S. Paul should write with such manifest bitterness of the inability of the older Apostles to control their followers, if their failure to do so had only resulted in a controversy in which he remained victorious. On the other hand it is natural that he should use the language of *v.* 6 about them if his memories of them in connection with the controversy as to circumcision were embittered by association with a serious defeat. The allusion is instructive as showing how little S. Paul sympathised with the "democratic" methods of the Church of Jerusalem, and how much more authority he claimed to exercise over his own converts.

Similarly the supposition that Titus was actually circumcised explains the fact

that there is no mention of him in the Acts. He was one of the leading personalities in S. Paul's staff, as is clear from the part he plays in the Corinthian disputes, yet his name is never mentioned. It seems likely that this is due to the fact that Titus was associated with a victory of the judaizing element in the Church; and the writer of the Acts always has them in his mind. He may well have wished to avoid any direct reference to Titus as likely to remind this section of their chief victory in the dispute.

It must of course be recognized that the opposite interpretation, that S. Paul resisted successfully the demand for the circumcision of Titus, is not impossible. It fails however to explain the language of Gal. ii. 6, although it gives a more natural interpretation of the Greek of *vv.* 3–5, where it is certainly harsh to understand *οὐδ'...ἠναγκάσθη* as meaning "was not compelled, although I did allow him to be circumcised as a matter of policy" and *εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ* "we did not yield as a matter of obedience, although we did yield as a matter of conciliation."

20. The language of Gal. ii. 10 is not of course to be interpreted merely as a vague and pious recommendation that the Gentile Christians should remember the fact that it is a Christian's duty to be charitable to his brethren. Had there been any question at this point of stating the moral obligations of the Christian it would have taken the lines of the decision of the Council, or more probably it would have laid down a still more detailed list of virtues to be practised and vices to be avoided (c. VI. § ii. n. 41). The word *μόνων* here, as in v. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 39, and 2 Thess. ii. 7, introduces a saving clause inserted as a necessary qualification of an absolute statement. Here it represents the one qualification introduced into the complete freedom with which the older Apostles recognize S. Paul's claims as regards the Gentiles. The point is of the utmost importance, since it shows that in this first agreement the claim of the Christians of Jerusalem to the alms of the Gentile converts was specifically recognized. The *πτωχοί* are of course the Hebrew Christians, not the poor in general. They are here described as "the Poor" *par excellence* on account of their pre-eminence in the point of evangelical poverty, just as in Ro. xv. 25, 1 Cor. xvi. 1 and 2 Cor. ix. 1 they are "the Saints" *par excellence* on account of their pre-eminent holiness. The most notable use of the phrase is in 2 Cor. viii. 9, where the argument is that Our Lord Himself became one of the *πτωχοί*, who have therefore a claim on the assistance of all Christians throughout the world. For the poverty and the general piety of the Hebrew Christians cf. c. I. nn. 28 and 44, and below, c. VII. § i. The name in its Aramaic form of *Ἐβίων* became later a nickname for the Jewish Christians in general, and various uncomplimentary interpretations for it were invented; but it had originally been a title of honour, showing the respect of the Gentile Christians for those who were able to practise literally the standard of perfection which others could only regard as an unattainable ideal. (For the term *Ἐβίων* cf. Orig. *De Princ.* iv. 24, *H.E.* iii. 27, vi. 17, and see Duchesne, *Hist. Ancienne de l'Église*, I.)

21. Cf. n. 19 above. Clearly S. Paul has a very poor opinion of leaders less autocratic than himself. It is somewhat remarkable that the Church in Jerusalem is from the outset far less subject to the Apostles than the Gentile communities are to S. Paul. This is probably due in part to the inferiority of the Apostles as Galileans to the Jews of Jerusalem (c. III. § ii. n. 18), and in part to S. Paul's consciousness of his superiority to his fellow-Jews and his personal temperament (cf. c. IV. § i. n. 42).

22. Naturally it is not to be supposed that there was any written agreement which was capable of various interpretations. On the other hand it would seem clear that it was possible for S. Peter at Antioch to separate the Jewish converts from the Gentiles for purposes of the common meal without any open violation of his word. Thus in Gal. ii. 11 *seqq.* S. Paul does not accuse him of deliberately going back on his agreement, but of hypocrisy and an erroneous view of the implications of the Gospel. This would be natural if in fact S. Peter and his colleagues merely expressed their willingness to leave SS. Barnabas and Paul a free hand in dealing with the Gentiles, and avoided a discussion as to the exact obligation of the Gentiles with regard to the Law. S. Paul might easily assume, and seems actually to have assumed, that this recognition involved a complete ratification of his position. On the other hand, from the Jewish point of view, there was a real difficulty as to the relations

of Jews to Gentiles in mixed communities, which the Apostles probably did not consider at the time. S. Peter himself, in view of his past experience, had ceased to care about such matters; but the more orthodox Jews of Hebrew origin would be certain to refuse to eat with Gentiles. Hence the apparent *concordat* was in fact little more than an attempt to shelve an awkward question, which, it might be hoped, would not often arise in practice, since there was no reason to anticipate a rapid diffusion of the Gospel throughout the Gentile world.

23. It must be remembered that at the moment the Gospel had only been preached in the larger towns of Syria and Cilicia, and there was no immediate prospect of any further extension of the Church. The energies of SS. Paul and Barnabas were fully occupied in those regions, and the Hebrew Christians showed no tendency to travel outside their own country. It might therefore seem natural to suppose that the Hebrew converts could in practice be kept more or less separate from the Gentiles, while many Hellenist Jews would not feel the same antipathy to mixing with the rest of mankind. (Cf. c. I. n. 50 for the comparative laxity of the Jews of the Dispersion as regards the Law.) It is perhaps not unreasonable to suppose that the older Apostles would be willing to give way to S. Paul without discussion rather than to argue on the question of principle at a moment when he was in the frame of mind implied in his narrative of the whole affair in Gal. ii. 6 and 9.

24. Of the reason for S. Peter's visit to Antioch we have no evidence; but it is quite probable that it was definitely arranged as a proof of his agreement with SS. Paul and Barnabas. The view that the incident of Gal. ii. 11 *seqq.* occurred before the interview between the five Apostles at Jerusalem and not after it hardly needs serious discussion. It rests only on the quite unfounded supposition that the agreement reached by the five Apostles was to the effect (*a*) that Gentile converts need not be circumcised, and (*b*) that Jewish Christians and uncircumcised Gentile converts must eat together at the common meals of the Church. As a matter of fact neither point is specifically mentioned. It was merely agreed that S. Paul and S. Barnabas were to have a free hand to act as Apostles in dealing with Gentile communities. No doubt S. Paul was right in claiming that both points logically followed from the agreement; but S. Peter's action did not involve any verbal breach of it. He merely claimed that he and his fellow-Christians of Jewish origin need not eat with uncircumcised Gentiles.

25. This seems the probable reason for the taking of John Mark; but it is possible that it is simply to be attributed to the personal wishes of S. Barnabas.

§ iv. PETER AT ANTIOCH

At first the new *concordat* seemed to have solved all difficulties. Peter arrived at Antioch and accepted fully the complete equality which prevailed as between Jews and Gentiles, both at the general worship of the Church and also at the common meals and the Eucharist. During his visit however some leading Christians from Jerusalem arrived in the city on a mission from James. Their presence was not due to any deliberate attempt on the part of the Church of Jerusalem to interfere with the organization of Antioch, but none the less it produced a disastrous effect[1]. They were profoundly shocked by the violation of the Law involved in the normal life of the Christian society there, and refused to eat with the Gentile converts. They did not indeed demand their circumcision, but they had no intention of abandoning their own loyalty to the religion of their fathers. In this respect Saul himself agreed with them, for he recognized that Jews

were bound to obey the Law. On the other hand he denied that it applied within the Church. Certainly the Jew might not eat with the Gentile sinner, but the Christian Gentile possessed a righteousness superior to anything that the Law could give, and was therefore no longer unclean[2]. On the other hand the Jewish leaders maintained that for the purposes of the Law an uncircumcised Gentile was still a Gentile, whether he were a Christian or not, and it was therefore unlawful for a Jew to eat with him.

Peter did not feel himself strong enough to resist this demand. Hitherto he had eaten with Gentiles, but at this point he withdrew, and made arrangements by which he and his fellow-Jews were able to separate themselves at the common meals from their Gentile fellow-Christians. Even Barnabas withdrew with him. The action was a compromise, which did not formally violate the agreement reached at Jerusalem, since it did not interfere with Saul's right to deal with his Gentile converts as he saw fit. It only implied that for purposes where the Law demanded the separation of Jews and Gentiles, the two sections of the Church were to be kept apart[3]. Saul however realized the impossibility of the suggested compromise. It involved separation in precisely that one part of Christian worship where unity was most essential. In view of the whole tradition and temper of Judaism, such a separation could only result in a belief that Jewish Christians were superior to Gentile converts, which would certainly issue in a fresh demand for the circumcision of such converts and the exclusion from the Church of all who refused to become proselytes of the synagogue[4].

Saul at once protested vigorously. The attempted compromise was mere hypocrisy, since it was idle to pretend that Gentiles were not bound to obey the Law, if Jews who did obey it were superior to them. Further—and this was his strongest argument—Peter had no right to profess such a devotion to the Law at all. For although he was a Jew and therefore bound to obedience to the Law, yet his alleged obedience was in fact little better than the life of the Gentile[5]. Keeping the Law meant keeping the whole Law, not a few isolated enactments; and in the eyes of the Pharisee this was all that Peter and the bulk of his Hebrew colleagues were doing. Since they did not keep the Law themselves they had no right to claim superiority over the Gentiles even from a Jewish point of view.

Such was the line of argument which Saul put forward with his utmost energy in front of the whole community. He could not appeal to the agreement made at Jerusalem, since the action of Peter and his

companions was formally compatible with the terms of that agreement. Further the Jewish emissaries with whom the trouble had originated would in all probability refuse to be bound by an agreement in which they had not been consulted. They could not indeed claim any authority from the Church of Jerusalem for the action which had caused the controversy; but from their own point of view no such authority was necessary. They had simply obeyed the Law, which forbad Jews to eat with Gentiles; and they had no need of authority in a matter of obedience to the Law. Peter did not feel himself strong enough to disregard their opposition to any abandonment of the orthodox Jewish practice, and withdrew from Antioch with the delegates from James, leaving Saul in possession of the field[6], rather than risk either the disruption of the Church in the city or a deliberate rejection by the Antiochene Christians of any sort of allegiance to the older Christian bodies; for one of these results was bound to follow from Saul's refusal to accept the idea of a Church in which Jews and Gentiles could not meet for the Eucharist and the common meal. His departure resulted in the abandonment by Barnabas and the rest of the Jewish Christians of the shortlived attempt to settle the dispute by the compromise which Peter had invented. (This account of the course of events seems to be the most probable interpretation of the very fragmentary evidence available.)

None the less an intolerable situation was left. It was clearly useless to return to Jerusalem to settle the matter. Saul had already come to one settlement with those whom he regarded as the rulers of the Church of the Hebrews, but it was quite clear that those rulers were unable to control their followers effectively. Both at Jerusalem and at Antioch the rank and file of the Christians of Jerusalem had carried the day against the wishes of the Apostles. There was no reason to suppose either that they would accept any fresh agreement he might make with those Apostles, or that an appeal to the whole Church of Jerusalem would have the smallest prospect of success. Nor could he appeal to any other body, since the vast majority of Christians were Jewish, and the Christians of Judaea were no less fanatical in their zeal for the Law than those of Jerusalem[7]. On the other hand the equality of Jew and Gentile established at Antioch must at all costs be preserved, if the Church was to make any effective appeal to the Gentile world.

In its difficulty the Antiochene Church decided to have recourse to divine guidance. A solemn service of prayer and fasting was held

with the intention of asking for inspiration for the course to be followed[8]. The answer given counselled a line of action, which from a human point of view was a bold, but none the less a wise one. The controversy between Antioch and Jerusalem had reached a deadlock. On the other hand it owed its origin to the almost accidental founding of the Church of Antioch after the martyrdom of Stephen, but for which the idea of a non-Jewish Christianity might never have arisen at all. The way to solve it was to continue the methods which had led to its being raised in the first instance. Saul and Barnabas were the Apostles of the Gentiles, and it was their duty to proceed further afield in the fulfilment of the task to which they were called[9].

In any case the Antiochenes had no choice but to obey the divine message. At the same time there were obvious possibilities for arriving at a solution of the difficulty, if, instead of confining Gentile Christianity to Antioch and Cilicia, it was decided to appeal to the Jews of the Dispersion, and through them to the Gentiles, over a wider area. The result of success would be to transfer the centre of the influence of the Church from Jerusalem and the Palestinian bodies dependent on it to Antioch and the Churches of the Gentiles. The effect of such an increase of the influence of Antioch might well convince the zealots of Jerusalem of the futility of endeavouring to impose their views on communities which represented a larger part of the whole Christian body than they themselves formed. Though numbering many influential members of the Church, they could not claim that their views were shared by any of the recognized leaders of Christendom, who in fact found their zeal rather awkward and would probably welcome any argument that would silence them[10]. At present the discipline of Saul's converts enabled him to speak with a considerable degree of superiority as against leaders who could not control their followers[11].

Thus the proposal that Saul and Barnabas should continue the specific task allotted to them in the Church of appealing to the Dispersion and the Gentiles was by no means unjustifiable on grounds of policy. On the other hand it contained certain elements of danger. If the party of circumcision proved strong enough to carry with them the whole body of Jewish Christians the result might well be a schism between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, not merely in Syria and Cilicia, but throughout the world. The Jews of the Dispersion, although they had originally been prepared to accept Saul's view of the equality of the Gentiles, and although they had

reverted to it on the departure of Peter and the Jewish leaders who had introduced the disturbing element at Antioch, had none the less wavered. It was possible that an organized campaign among the Jews of the Dispersion undertaken by the leaders of the party of circumcision would result in the refusal of the Jewish converts to accept Saul's teaching, especially in view of the probability that by insisting on the observance of the Law by Gentile converts they could hope to avoid the danger of a quarrel with their unconverted fellow-countrymen. For although in the main the Jews of the Dispersion were inclined to reduce the demands made of their proselytes to a minimum, and although some among them were deplorably lax in their personal observance of the Law, yet the vast majority of them were proud of their zeal for its maintenance, and were filled with horror at the general moral standard of the heathen world, from which the Law alone preserved the Chosen People in their exile[12]. It was certain that Jewish Christians of the Dispersion would be regarded as apostates, if they consented to mix on equal terms with uncircumcised Gentile converts, and would have to suffer violent persecution at the hands of their unconverted brethren. Hence Jewish converts, although willing to embrace S. Paul's views as to the Gospel, might well waver in their loyalty, if they had to face not only this persecution from their brethren, but also a campaign by Jewish Christians, some of them of high standing, in favour of the imposition of the Law on the Gentile Christians[13]. Nor would it be possible in the first instance to avoid placing Jewish converts, or proselytes of some standing, who might well be as zealous for the Law as the Jews themselves, in the most important positions of trust and authority in any new communities that might be formed. Newly converted Gentiles would not ordinarily be trustworthy enough for responsible duties.

Hence there was always a possibility that the proposed appeal to a wider Gentile circle would result not in creating a counter-balance to the influence of the party of circumcision, but actually in strengthening it. None the less it was accepted as ordered by divine authority. So far as the general authority of the Church was concerned Saul claimed that the circumstances of his conversion gave him all the rights of an Apostle in dealing with the Gentile world; and in so far as human confirmation was needed, it was supplied both by his original mission from Jerusalem to Cilicia and still more by the recognition of his Apostolate to the Gentiles by Peter and John and James on the occasion of his recent visit to Jerusalem[14]. Barnabas

had the original authority of the high position he had held at Jerusalem, and also his mission to settle affairs at Antioch. Neither, however, was likely to be recognized by the party of circumcision on the strength of these claims as possessing a right to appeal in this fashion to the Gentile world; and it was likely that there would be a violent struggle before the issue could be definitely settled. None the less the next move was clear; the final result must be left to time to decide.

[It will of course be observed that the view advanced above, that the decision to evangelize the Gentile world from Antioch was a direct result of the difficult situation produced by the controversy in that city, is based on what appears to be the most probable interpretation of the available evidence, but has no direct authority from the original narrative of the Acts.]

NOTES TO CHAPTER V, SECTION IV

1. S. James in Acts xv. 24 repudiates the demand for the circumcision of the Gentile converts raised later by the Hebrew Christians at Antioch. This is perfectly in accordance with the attitude which he would naturally adopt as a Pharisee (c. III. § ii. n. 36 *ad fin.*). Zeal for the imposition of isolated prescriptions of the Law proceeds throughout from popular Judaism, not from the Pharisees (c. I. n. 46, and see below, c. VI. § ii. n. 37). Hence it seems natural to suppose that the emissaries from him mentioned in Gal. ii. 12 were sent on some mission to S. Peter which had no immediate connection with the question at issue at Antioch. On the other hand it would be natural that in consulting S. Peter on any matter of importance S. James should employ Christians of some standing, who would naturally be Jews of the popular type in respect of their observance of the Law. Such Christians were the main element of strength in the party of circumcision, and were rendered formidable by the fact that they were converts of considerable eminence (c. I. n. 37 and c. III. § ii *ad fin.*, and for the probability that S. James would employ messengers of some eminence in communicating with S. Peter on any question of importance § iii. n. 15). Although S. Peter had persuaded Christians of this type to ratify his action in the case of Cornelius, they were not prepared to admit that the principle involved applied indiscriminately to all Gentiles (c. IV. § ii. n. 12).

2. This is the point of S. Paul's argument in Gal. ii. 15. The Gentile Christians in virtue of their baptism have ceased to be ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί and have received the true righteousness which is given in Christ, but is not given by the Law. Hence instead of being inferior to unbaptized Jews, with whom his opponents would not scruple to eat, they are in fact superior to them. Consequently the levitical law as to ceremonial purity, which S. Paul admits the Jew is bound to obey, has no bearing on the relation of Jews to Christian Gentiles (c. IV. § i. nn. 25, 54).

3. § iii. n. 22.

4. It is to be noted that S. Paul does not charge either S. Peter or the Hebrew emissaries who had caused the trouble with making any demand for the circumcision of the Gentile converts, nor does he claim that S. Peter had definitely violated the agreement reached at Jerusalem. None the less the action of S. Peter involved in practice the whole question of circumcision. The only common ground on which Jewish and Gentile Christians would meet would be the synagogues. It is, however, probable that at Antioch there were no specifically Christian synagogues (§ i. n. 8); and if the Christians desired to attend this kind of worship, they would have to use the Jewish synagogues, where it would seem that the Gentiles occupied an

inferior place. For the seats in the synagogue were arranged in order of dignity (*G.J.V.* II. 526), and a Gentile would naturally rank below the Jews. (Cf. *G.J.V.* III. 186 *seqq.* for the inferiority of proselytes and 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 23, 24, where ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου clearly occupies a separate place from the baptized Christians. Here it would seem we have a Jewish practice carried over into the Church from the synagogue.) Even if the Christians at Antioch had separate synagogues of their own, it might easily follow from a separation of Jews and Gentiles for the common meal that the Jewish Christians would also demand separate, and by implication superior, seats in the synagogue.

5. Gal. ii. 14, where S. Peter's method of observing the Law is described as "living like a Gentile." So in Gal. vi. 13 his judaizing opponents do not keep the Law, since they are not Pharisees; their observance of parts of it is worthless. See c. I. n. 46.

6. Although S. Paul in Gal. ii gives no account of the ending of his controversy with S. Peter the view advanced in the text seems to be the only one which covers the facts. Had S. Peter recognized his error and resumed his earlier practice of eating with the Gentiles S. Paul would hardly fail to record so notable a triumph. His failure to do so suggests that at the time when he wrote to the Galatians the whole matter remained undecided. On the other hand it is clear from the subsequent co-operation of SS. Paul and Barnabas that the Jewish converts of Antioch, with S. Barnabas at their head, fell into line with S. Paul on the matter. They could hardly have done so while S. Peter and the emissaries from S. James remained at Antioch, without risking a complete separation from the Christians of Jerusalem.

7. Acts xxi. 20.

8. The sequence of events suggested in the text is of course conjectural. On the other hand, if the visit of S. Peter to Antioch followed the visit to Jerusalem at which the first *concordat* was reached, and if that visit is identical with the visit at the time of the famine (and both of these views seem beyond dispute for the reasons given in § iii), the period between S. Peter's visit to Antioch and the decision to start on the "first missionary journey" must have been a brief one. The famine visit falls late in A.D. 47 or early in A.D. 48, while S. Paul is at Corinth in the course of his second journey in the summer of A.D. 51 (see below, c. VI. § v. n. 36). Of the intervening events it seems that the journey from the Syrian Antioch to Cyprus and "Galatia" occupies the whole of one travelling season, the return journey from Derbe to the Syrian Antioch with the Council and the ministry of SS. Paul and Barnabas in Syria which preceded and followed the Council occupying another. The second journey may fairly be supposed to have been opened with the beginning of a third travelling season; at the end of this S. Paul begins the long ministry at Corinth, in the middle of which falls his meeting with Gallio in the summer of A.D. 51 (see below, c. VI. § i. n. 32, § iii. n. 1, § v. n. 36). This implies that the start of the first journey falls in A.D. 48, and it is to be presumed that it fell fairly early in the travelling season. In this case we have an interval between the famine visit and the opening of the first missionary journey of not more than six months, assuming the famine visit to have fallen late in A.D. 47, and in this period falls the visit of S. Peter to Antioch. It is hard to suppose in this case that the decision to appeal to a wider circle of Gentiles, taken so soon after S. Peter's visit, was entirely independent of that visit and its somewhat disastrous conclusion.

Some confirmation of the view suggested is to be found in the language of Acts xiii. 1–3. We have two references to fasts, one preceding the divine command to proceed on the mission, and one preceding the solemn service by which SS. Paul and Barnabas are commissioned to start their journey. Normally, no doubt, the Church would observe the customary Jewish fasts, but there can be no reason for mentioning this here. Consequently it seems likely that the fast which preceded the decision to set out on the journey was a special one, undertaken for the purpose of obtaining divine guidance in view of the difficulty raised by S. Peter's visit and left unsolved by the manner of his departure. This explains the very clumsy reference to two fasts in two verses. Fasting on the occasion of an emergency of any kind was of course a common Jewish practice, cf. Ezra viii. 21, Neh. ix. 1, Esther iv. 16, Judith iv. 13, 1 Macc. iii. 47, 2 Macc. xiii. 12, etc. It seems therefore not improbable that S. Luke here is alluding to a difficult situation which he has

not recorded, but which he probably thought his immediate readers would remember. Cf. his treatment of the visit of S. Barnabas to Antioch in Acts xi. 22 *seqq.*

9. Here we have an inspiration (its form is not stated), which suggests a course of action which might have been attained to by the ordinary processes of human reason. The considerations suggested in the text might well have led to the decision to make an appeal to a wider circle of Gentiles. Such an action involved a risk of creating a permanent division between Jewish and Gentile Christians; but on the other hand it offered almost the only means for coercing the extremists among the Hebrews into yielding to S. Paul's point of view.

10. c. I. n. 46, c. IV. § i. n. 58, and for S. James cf. n. 1 above.

11. § iii. n. 19.

12. c. I. nn. 49, 50, 58.

13. S. Paul charges the judaizers in the Galatian Churches with seeking to impose circumcision on the Gentiles in order to avoid persecution (Gal. vi. 12, cf. v. 11). Whether in Palestine or among the Churches of the Dispersion, the position of the Jewish converts would have been very much easier, if the Gentile converts had been circumcised. They would thus have become proselytes of Judaism, and the Church would have become a peculiar sect, against which the Jewish world in general would have no complaint to make. It must be remembered that S. Paul's attitude on the subject of the Law in fact meant persecution for the Jewish converts. This would especially be the case in Palestine, where S. Paul, who was known to be a leading member of the Christian body, was also, at a later stage, regarded by many of the Jews, not without justice from their own point of view, as teaching apostasy pure and simple (cf. Acts xxi. 21 and see c. VII. § ii. n. 21). The weakness of the Jewish converts, and even of S. Barnabas, at Antioch proved that an initial enthusiasm for S. Paul's point of view could not be trusted to survive the pressure which would certainly be brought to bear on Jewish converts, in favour of observing the demands of the national faith.

14. Cf. Gal. i. 1, from which it is clear that it is not only S. Paul's teaching that has been attacked but also his authority as an Apostle, and see Appendix on the Apostolate.

CHAPTER VI

THE APPEAL TO THE WORLD

§i. CYPRUS AND GALATIA

THE appeal from the Hebrew Christians and their attempt to impose their beliefs on the whole Church, to the Jews of the Dispersion and the Gentile world, was inaugurated with due solemnity. A solemn service of prayer and fasting was held, at which Saul and Barnabas received in the customary form of the imposition of hands by the leading converts of Antioch the authorization and blessing of the community for the work they were about to undertake[1]. They were accompanied on their venture by John Mark.

From Seleucia, the port of Antioch, the party proceeded to Salamis in Cyprus. The choice of the island was dictated by several considerations. In the first place it was natural to proceed with the work of evangelization on geographical lines, and the island formed an obvious extension of the area already touched by the work of the Apostles in Syria and Cilicia[2]. Further, the Gospel had already been preached in Cyprus by the earliest refugees from Jerusalem, and it was desirable to organize the existing converts of the island into regular Churches and if possible to win them to the side of Antioch[3]. Still more important was the fact that the existence of these Christians provided an excuse for the visit, since it was arguable that the original commission of Barnabas implied the duty of supervising all the work of the first evangelists outside Judaea and Samaria. From this point of view Cyprus might be regarded as falling within his province, and the action of the Apostles of Antioch in visiting the island need not necessarily be regarded as a deliberate defiance of the authority of the Church of Jerusalem. The mission was indeed a direct challenge, but it was desirable to postpone, if possible, a formal declaration of war. The fact that Cyprus could be represented as falling within the sphere allotted to Barnabas by Jerusalem made it possible for that body to avoid the necessity of looking upon the work done there as a deliberate attempt to break with the authority of the Apostles and the Mother-Church[4]. In addition Cyprus was the native country of Barnabas, a fact which might be expected to add to his influence in appealing to his former compatriots[5].

The Jews of Cyprus formed a numerous community. Augustus had leased a half-share of the copper-mines, which formed the chief local industry, to Herod the Great. The result had been the formation of Jewish colonies which in some districts actually outnumbered the

Gentile inhabitants. This preponderance freed them from the necessity of conciliating their neighbours, and they retained to the full their national exclusiveness and hatred for the heathen[6]. Hence the Apostles found on their arrival that the influence of the earlier missionaries had not extended outside the synagogues, which made little attempt to attract the Gentiles and were not likely to encourage adherents who were unwilling to accept the full burden of proselytism. Consequently the work of evangelization was practically confined to the Jews and fell in practice to Barnabas[7]. From Salamis the party crossed the island to Paphos, the administrative capital[8]. Here an incident occurred which gave Saul an opening. The proconsul, Sergius Paulus, had found in Cyprus a Jew named Elymas or Bar-Jesus, a teacher who combined some knowledge of the methods by which Judaism could be harmonized with Hellenic thought with the practice of sorcery for which his nation was famous. Through him the proconsul had acquired an interest in the Jewish religion, and he learnt in the synagogue of the arrival of Saul and Barnabas. He was anxious to hear more of the latest novelty in the Jewish religion while his former director was equally anxious to prevent him from doing so[9]. The result was a collision between the two exponents of Judaism in which Saul won an indisputable victory and secured the conversion of Sergius Paulus[10].

With this success achieved the missionaries left the island for Perga in Pamphylia, intending to return by sea to Syria[11]. Paul however (who from this point onwards in the New Testament assumes his Gentile name)[12] could hardly be satisfied with the results hitherto accomplished. The mission had produced no considerable accession of Gentile converts. On the other hand, by proceeding inland the party could reach the main road from Tarsus which ran through the Pisidian Antioch to proconsular Asia and Ephesus. Asia was a region which offered prospects little inferior to those of Syria itself. Naturally he could not contemplate working there at the moment, but he could lay the foundation for a future visit by preaching in the towns which lay between the Pisidian Antioch and the region which he had already evangelized in Cilicia. Such a mission could be regarded, like that to Cyprus, as an extension of work already undertaken with the full consent of the Church rather than as an entirely new and unauthorized adventure, while an attack of sickness at Perga furnished a further excuse for visiting the healthier inland region[13]. John Mark indeed was unable to accept this view and returned to Jerusalem; Barnabas however

was less inclined to respect the authority of the Church in that city, and continued with Paul on his extension of their journey[14].

Without waiting to preach at Perga[15] the two companions made their way to the Pisidian Antioch, where there was a Jewish settlement of some size, living on friendly terms with the Gentile inhabitants, and enjoying in particular a considerable influence over the local aristocracy, descendants of the colonists planted there by Augustus some seventy years before[16]. Thus, on entering the synagogue on the sabbath after their first arrival, Paul and Barnabas found themselves in the presence of an audience which included a large number of Gentiles, more or less loosely attached to Judaism, and likely to welcome with enthusiasm the news that the old burden of legal observances had been abolished by the revelation in Jesus of the full righteousness foreshadowed by the prophets—a revelation whose truth was guaranteed by the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Paul, whose dress proclaimed him a Pharisee, was naturally invited to address the assembled worshippers[17]. Naturally before such an audience he devoted his opening address to a demonstration of the facts that the Old Testament revelation implied the coming of a saviour of Israel, and that this Saviour had appeared in the person of Jesus[18]. His claims were proved to be genuine by the historically attested fact of the Resurrection[19], while the salvation He had come to bring took the form of a new power to attain to that ideal of righteousness which the Law upheld as an ideal, without giving any power to realize it[20]. At the same time he warned his hearers of the danger that awaited them in the event of their refusing to accept the new message. His words were well received by many of his Jewish hearers and by a large number of the Gentile adherents of the synagogue, who met Paul after the conclusion of the service and received further instruction as to the supersession of the old system of the Law by the new gift of the Christian revelation. By the next sabbath[21] news of the appearance of a sudden development of Jewish teaching of a revolutionary character had obtained a wide publicity, and the synagogue was filled to overflowing with Gentiles of the class for whom Judaism had always possessed a high degree of attraction[22]. The sight of the crowds infuriated the more orthodox Jews, who could not fail to be embittered at the sight of the success won by the new teachers among those to whom they had been preaching the old system for years past. Further the new teaching was a direct negation of the claims of the nation to be the exclusive possessor of the true knowledge of God. The Law had always satisfied them, and they

saw no need for anything to supersede it. The fact that the new doctrines appealed so strongly to the Gentiles could only arouse their suspicion. Most of these Gentiles had refused to accept the burden of proselytism, and it was natural that such people should welcome a system, which offered them a new form of salvation on easy terms, by absolving them from the duty of obedience to the Law; but the abolition of the Law meant the abolition of the only guarantee for the moral standards of Judaism[23]. Violent attacks were made on Paul's teaching, and it was clear that the majority of the synagogue would have nothing to do with the Gospel.

The Apostles had however gained a sufficient following among the Gentiles and a certain element of the Jews to justify them in continuing their work in the city. Accordingly they solemnly proclaimed to the Jews that they had by their opposition forfeited all claim to hear the Gospel first[24]. From henceforth it was to be preached to the Gentiles without the interposition of the synagogue. Legally there were difficulties about the proposal, since Judaism enjoyed the official recognition of the Empire, while the teaching of new religions was formally prohibited. This by itself would scarcely be a serious obstacle, since the general tolerance of the age made it unlikely that any new cult would be interfered with in practice. Jewish hostility might however easily lead to violent opposition and forcible attempts by the Jews to suppress the preachers of Christianity. This was a serious matter. A new religion which caused breaches of the peace was almost certain to be suppressed as a public nuisance[25]. In the event of a riot, Gentile magistrates were not likely to listen to Paul's arguments, intended to prove that Christianity was not a new religion, but the true development, or at least a legitimate development, of Judaism. If they were compelled to interfere they could hardly fail to take the view that the synagogue was the true representative of the old Judaism and Christianity a new cult, which, since it had led to disturbances, ought to be suppressed[26].

For a time no untoward results followed. Paul was able to establish a Christian community at Antioch, separate from the synagogue and composed in the first instance of a certain number of Jewish converts and Gentile proselytes and adherents of the synagogue. Such a community provided a centre from which Christianity could permeate the rest of the city and the rural districts adjoining it[27]. The Church however was not left in peace for long. The Jews could not afford to leave their rival unchallenged, and their hold on some of the leading women of the city, who adhered to the synagogue, was strong

enough to enable them to persuade the local magistrates to expel the new teachers from the area of their jurisdiction[28]. Unfortunately the blow fell before the community had been organized sufficiently to render the continued presence of the Apostles unnecessary. No steps had been taken to provide it with any organization which would be responsible for the conduct of worship and the instruction of new converts; and the order for the Apostles to leave the city left no time for making good the deficiency[29].

The Apostles accordingly departed, leaving behind them a body which for the moment was filled with enthusiasm. The main line of their route along the *via Sebaste* led direct to the town of Lystra; but it was natural for them to make a slight deviation in order to visit the important centre of Iconium[30]. Here, as at Antioch, there was a Jewish settlement, which had paved the way for the preaching of the Gospel. Many of the Jews were ready to give it a favourable hearing, and were converted along with a large body of Gentile followers. Consequently the Apostles were able to conduct a fairly lengthy mission, public feeling being equally divided as between them and the Jews who refused the new doctrines and sought with considerable success to inflame public feeling against their exponents. The magistrates took fright at the prospect of a disturbance of the peace. They hesitated to undertake direct proceedings, but it was easy for them to arrange not to interfere with an attack by the mob against the two missionaries, as a result of which they might be handed over to the Jews and stoned by them. The whole proceeding could, if any question were raised, be represented as a deplorable incident for which the magistrates could scarcely be held responsible; the Jews would regard the stoning as the proper enforcement of the Law against new and blasphemous doctrines, and their action, although illegal, would not be regarded as very serious, since the Roman world was well accustomed to the eccentric beliefs and special privileges of the Jewish nation[31].

The plot however miscarried, since it was discovered by the Apostles, who left immediately for Lystra. They had however, as at Antioch, been forced to leave prematurely, with the result that a change of plan became imperative. They could not simply return overland to Cilicia and leave the Churches already founded in this region to their own devices until such time as they had returned to Palestine and settled the difficulties which were certain to face them there. It therefore became necessary to wait in the neighbourhood until it was possible to revisit Iconium and Antioch before proceeding to Syria,

a decision which involved the spending of a winter in these regions. Accordingly they devoted themselves to the evangelization of the two Lycaonian towns of Lystra and Derbe, lying between Iconium and the frontiers of the kingdom of Antiochus of Commagene. Here the Jewish inhabitants were few, and by working quietly among them and the Gentiles, without staying too long in either place, they could hope to escape the attentions of their enemies at Antioch and Iconium until it was safe to revisit the Churches in these two cities and place them on a more satisfactory footing[32]. Unfortunately a sensational cure worked by Paul, which led to an attempted apotheosis of the two Apostles, gained for them a considerable local notoriety; apparently it was through this incident that the Jews of Antioch and Iconium learnt their hiding-place and sent emissaries to put an end to their troublesome activities[33]. With the help of the mob they succeeded in executing the plan which had failed at Iconium. Paul was dragged outside the city, stoned and left for dead. His enemies withdrew, supposing that they had achieved their object[34]. They were however mistaken, and by the time that his converts came to bury him Paul had recovered and was able to return to the city. The next day he withdrew to Derbe, where he established himself for the winter. He was able to carry on his work here unmolested and to found a Christian community without any necessity of leaving before his work was finished. There were very few Jews in the town, and by avoiding publicity he was able to conceal his presence from his enemies in Antioch and Iconium[35].

In the spring of A.D. 50 the local magistrates of these cities had given place to their successors, and it seemed safe to return along his former route in order to consolidate the organization of his disciples. This could be done without any attempt to win converts on a large scale, a proceeding which might have been dangerous[36]. He found his disciples suffering a certain amount of persecution, the Jews being naturally anxious to suppress a movement which cut short their supply of Gentile converts. Thus the Jewish Christians were bound to suffer at the hands of their orthodox brethren, while the Gentile Christians had to face the contempt of their neighbours for those who embraced the Jewish superstition[37]. The Apostles had therefore to encourage their converts to persevere in the face of their difficulties and also to provide them with recognized rulers to preside at the worship of the Church, to instruct the faithful and inquirers after the truth, and, if possible, to exercise discipline over offending members of the community[38]. Since there were no converts of any

standing who could bear witness to the life and teaching of the Lord, it would obviously be unsafe to leave the new societies in charge simply of those who happened to be the most prominent in spiritual gifts, such as prophecy and speaking with tongues. Accordingly the Apostles appointed in each city presbyters, whose claims to consideration rested not on any purely personal gifts apart from general reliability of character, but on the fact that they had after solemn prayer and fasting been authorized by the imposition of hands by the Apostles to exercise authority over the life and worship of the Church in their absence. The appointment was thus a delegation of the authority of the Apostles, and the influence which those appointed could exercise over the rest of the community depended on the extent to which the memory and influence of the first teachers survived among the converts after their departure, or on the extent to which those appointed were able to establish a personal predominance for themselves. For the most part it was inevitable that they should be chosen from among the Jewish converts or those who had been proselytes of some standing before their conversion, since the general moral level of the Gentile world obviously made it unsafe to entrust new converts with a position for which personal holiness of a high order was essential.

After completing their work of consolidating the new communities at Lystra, Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch, the Apostles proceeded to Perga. They had not preached here on the occasion of their first visit, but since their future labours might involve frequent journeys between the inland Churches and Cyprus it was desirable to form a community in a city which was likely to be a regular stopping-place on their route[39]. From Attalia, the harbour of Perga, they returned to the Syrian Antioch and reported on the success of their labours to the body from which they had received their first commission. This action constituted the formal completion of their journey and implied the responsibility of the Antiochene community for the whole effort[40]. It remained to be seen how its claim to such rights of independent action would be received by the Church of Jerusalem, especially in view of the contentious question involved in the Gospel as preached by Paul to the Gentiles.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI, SECTION I

1. There is no question here of a "consecration" to the Apostolate. Although S. Luke does not refer to SS. Paul and Barnabas as Apostles until after the ceremony described in Acts xiii. 3, yet he has already implied that they had received an "Apostolic" commission of some kind from the Church of Jerusalem by his use of the word ἐξαποστέλλω in Acts ix. 30 and xi. 22 (c. IV. § i. n. 63). On the other hand S. Paul in Gal. i. 1 refuses to recognize his need of any human commission; his Apostolate is a direct divine gift, not communicated through any human agency (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1 and see Appendix on the Apostolate). The probability is that any solemn sending of a mission from one part of the Church to another, such as the mission of Silas and Judas Barsabbas in Acts xv. 22, would be preceded by prayer and fasting and a solemn imposition of hands for the purpose of conveying to the persons appointed the authority of the Church for their mission.

The use of the ceremony for this purpose would naturally be suggested by Jewish usage, according to which a Rabbi laid his hands on a disciple to make him a Rabbi (cf. Swete in Hastings' *D.B.* III. 84 *seqq.*); new members of the Sanhedrin were admitted by the same ceremony (c. V. § ii. n. 34). The use of the rite was suggested to the Jews by Deut. xxxiv. 9. In the case of the Jewish usage, as probably in the case of Christian presbyters, the rite was intended to convey a lifelong qualification for certain duties; but there seems no reason to suppose that it was not also used to convey a solemn authorization and blessing for a particular duty. If the explanation here given be correct, it would seem that the reason for its mention at this point is to show that the Antiochene community in using it claimed authority to send out missions, just as the Church of Jerusalem did. The supposition that this ceremony was the formal "consecration" of SS. Paul and Barnabas to the Apostolate is very difficult in view of S. Paul's own view of his claims to be an Apostle by divine appointment without human intervention; it is difficult to see how he could have consented to a ceremony which would naturally be interpreted as raising him to the Apostolate, especially as he had already been recognized by the older Apostles as the Apostle of the Gentiles.

2. From 58 B.C. to 22 B.C. the island of Cyprus was for administrative purposes united to Cilicia, except for the period of the division of the Empire, during which it was handed over to Cleopatra by Antony. It was separated in the latter year by Augustus and handed over to the Senate, probably more for the purpose of finding areas which could safely be made into senatorial provinces than for motives of administrative convenience.

3. Acts xi. 19, and cf. xxi. 16, where Mnason of Cyprus is apparently one of the original evangelists of the island. The probability is that he was a Hellenist of Cyprian origin, who was converted soon after Pentecost and returned to his old home at the time of the persecution (c. IV. § i. n. 68). This seems the only meaning of the words ἀρχαῖος μαθητής as applied to him by S. Luke; presumably he was senior to S. Paul in the order of conversion, or the words would be meaningless. The passage is, however, an obscure one, and it is possible that Mnason had never left Jerusalem, his Cypriot origin being mentioned in order to include in the party which arrives in the city with S. Paul representatives of all the Pauline Churches. For the reasons for which we hear so little of the work of the Apostles in Cyprus see below, n. 7.

4. The regions visited by SS. Paul and Barnabas in this journey are significant. The whole project was bound to excite opposition at Jerusalem among the party of circumcision, and was intended as a direct reply to their pretensions. None the less it would obviously be desirable not to make the challenge so direct that reconciliation would be impossible, and also to avoid a defiance which would unite the whole Church of Jerusalem against the Antiochenes. The Twelve were by no means whole-heartedly in sympathy with the party of circumcision, and it is quite possible that there were many Hebrews who shared their attitude. A mission sent direct to regions hitherto untouched by the Gospel without any reference to Jerusalem or the Twelve might well give offence even to those who otherwise were inclined to sympathise with the Pauline position. Hence the regions chosen are

such that the journey can be regarded not so much as a new mission to countries hitherto untouched as a natural extension of the spheres of work already allotted to the two Apostles by the Mother-Church. This is obvious in the case of Cyprus, since in visiting the island S. Barnabas was merely completing his original task of organizing the communities originally established by the Hellenist refugees. In the case of the Galatian Churches S. Paul could argue that he was merely extending his labours in Cilicia. The connection here was not so obvious, and apparently S. Mark was unable to accept it, and accordingly refused to proceed inland from Perga (see below, n. 11). None the less it would seem that at the Council S. Paul represented his labours in this light since the letter was addressed to the Churches in Syria and Cilicia (Acts xv. 23), although we are expressly told that it was delivered to the new Pauline Churches (Acts xvi. 4). The use of the term Cilicia to designate this area is not unparalleled (cf. Pliny, *N.H.* v. 93 and Ramsay in *J.R.S.* II. 277 *seqq.*), and this appears to be the explanation of the fact that the letter is only addressed to the Christians of Syria and Cilicia.

This view is confirmed by the fact that the Apostles of the Gentiles, although they present a report on their labours to the Church at Antioch on their return (Acts xiv. 27), yet also report on them on their arrival in Jerusalem (xv. 4). The presenting of such a report appears to be the formal ending of a journey (cf. xxi. 19) and is to some extent a recognition of the authority of Jerusalem. It would seem that at the Council S. Paul represented the mission to Galatia as an extension of his earlier work in Cilicia, and that the question was allowed to go by default owing to the fact that the attention of the Council was concentrated on the subject of circumcision. The defeat of the judaizers on this point made it hopeless for them to raise the issue of the authority of the Apostles in undertaking the journey without consulting the Mother-Church.

5. Acts iv. 36. It is to be presumed that the land which he sold was of some value or it would hardly be mentioned, and it is therefore possible that he had at one time been a person of some position in the island. This would increase his influence; but it is of course equally possible that his wealth was only acquired after his arrival in Jerusalem.

6. On the occasion of the outbreak of the Jews in Cyprus in the reign of Trajan (apparently in A.D. 116), the Jews were strong enough to massacre their neighbours (Dio Cassius lxviii. 32; his statement that the number murdered amounted to 240,000 is of course a ludicrous exaggeration; it appears from Orosius vii. 12 and Eus. *Chron.* ii. 164 that the scene of the massacre was Salamis). It would scarcely be possible for the Jews to carry out a general massacre of their neighbours unless they were locally in the majority. It is to be noted that S. Luke specifically mentions a number of synagogues in Acts xiii. 5. It seems reasonable to suppose that the presence of so large a number of Jews in Salamis was due to the importation of workers by Herod in connection with the copper-mines and that they continued to be engaged in them after his death. The massacre shows the hostility of the Jews to the local Gentile population, and this hostility seems to have been as old as S. Paul's visit.

7. Acts xiii. 5. We hear no mention of any appeal to the Gentiles of Cyprus, nor of any conversion of Gentiles attending the synagogues. It has already been noted that in practice S. Barnabas appears to be mainly concerned with the Jewish portion of the mixed community at Antioch (c. v. § i. n. 21), and he clearly retains the leading position in the mission until the conversion of Sergius Paulus. Further, S. Luke shows no interest in the history of the mission at Salamis. The inference is that in fact S. Paul found very little work to do there for the reason that the synagogues were so little attended by Gentiles that they did not furnish any opening for reaching them. It is noteworthy that here, as at Caesarea, where a similar hostility prevailed, the only Gentile convert of whom we hear is of Italian origin (c. iv. § ii. n. 6). Apparently there seemed no prospect of doing anything at Salamis but organizing the old converts and their disciples of Jewish origin into a Christian community and making a certain number of fresh Jewish converts (cf. Acts xi. 19, where the evangelists in Cyprus are represented as speaking only to the Jews, not to the Greeks, as are those at Antioch). It is easier also to understand S. Paul's abandonment of Cyprus to S. Barnabas, if he had no converts there.

8. There is no reason to suppose that any attempt was made to preach in the interior of the island. For the mistaken view that the word διέρχομαι has any missionary significance see note at the end of this section.

9. The appearance of Bar-Jesus or Elymas presents a certain difficulty. There would be nothing improbable in supposing that a Roman official could be interested in a Jewish sorcerer of a thoroughly disreputable type. Cf. the interest of Vespasian and Titus in a Jewish sorcerer in *Antt.* VIII. ii. 5, and for the character of such persons cf. the Jewish sorcerer from Cyprus named Simon in *Antt.* XX. vii. 2. For Jewish sorcery in general cf. *G.J.V.* III. 407 *seqq.*; for its notoriety among the Gentiles cf. Pliny, *N.H.* XXX. 1 (11).

On the other hand it is not easy to see how Sergius Paulus would hear of the arrival of the Apostles, if Elymas was merely a sorcerer of this type. He would not be in any great favour with the Jews of the synagogue, nor would he be likely to persuade the proconsul to worship there, if he simply tried to trade on his credulity by alleged miracles. It seems more probable that he was a travelling Jewish teacher, who had attached himself to the establishment of the proconsul as a domestic philosopher after the manner described by Lucian in his *De Mercede Conductis*. There would be nothing unnatural in his combining the teaching of Judaism as a variety of Hellenistic philosophy with the practice of exorcism and similar forms of "magic." In this case the description of him in Acts xiii. 6 as primarily a sorcerer must be compared to the treatment of Simon Magus in viii. 9 (cf. c. III. § i. n. 8). It is to be remembered that exorcism was practised by quite respectable Jews (Mt. xii. 27, cf. apparently the "sons of Sceva the High Priest" in Acts xix. 14, though the whole passage is very difficult; cf. also *Jub.* x. 10 *seqq.* for a Jewish identification of magic and medicine, and Orig. *Contra Celsum* v. 612). Sergius Paulus in this case is to be regarded as already interested in the Jewish religion, though his interest would seem to be derived rather from the philosophy of Elymas than from the worship of the synagogue. He would, however, naturally attend the Jewish services, and might easily hear the Apostles preach there. Such interest in foreign cults, especially in Judaism, was by no means uncommon among the Roman official class at the period in spite of the dislike of foreign superstitions, especially Judaism, prevalent in contemporary writers. Cf. *Antt.* XVIII. iii. 5 (see also the preceding section for a similar devotion to Egyptian cults), XX. viii. 11, Suet. *Dom.* 15 (the consul Flavius Clemens and his wife, Domitilla, who were apparently Christians; cf. Dio Cass. lxvii. 13, 14, *H.E.* iii. 18. For the probability that the Acilius Glabrio mentioned by Dio Cassius was also a Christian cf. *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.* IV. 1392, and VI. 1259). (Cf. also Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 15, and Lucian's account of Alexander of Abonoteichos, and Philostratus' life of Apollonius of Tyana.)

10. The statement that he "believed" in Acts xiii. 12 can hardly be interpreted as meaning less than that he was baptized, the omission of any mention of the baptism of believers being common, as in xiii. 48, xiv. 1, xvii. 34, xviii. 8. In the last case there is clearly no distinction between Crispus, who "believes," and the many Corinthians who "believe and are baptized"; in fact Crispus was baptized by S. Paul himself (1 Cor. i. 14). It is to be remembered that S. Paul was quite capable of administering baptism with practically no preliminary instruction, cf. Acts xvi. 33. In any case, however, the conversion of the proconsul at this period would not excite much attention in Roman circles, where foreign religions were common. The fact that he does not appear in Christian literature except for the late and worthless legends of Cyprus cannot be regarded as surprising in view of our general lack of information as to the period. It is likely that a Roman official would not care to take a very prominent part in the life of the Church for fear of exposing himself to the danger of attacks from which less important Christians were exempt until the persecutions.

11. This can only be conjectured, since it is possible that an extension of S. Paul's existing Cilician province was contemplated from the first. On the other hand it is clear that the ordinary merchant vessel from Asia to Syria did not touch at Cyprus, unless on account of the weather (Acts xxi. 3, xxvii. 4). Hence it would be natural to sail from Paphos to Perga in order to find a ship for Antioch there. Further, S. Paul writes in Gal. iv. 13 that his first visit to the Galatian Churches

was δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός. The meaning of the words would naturally be "on account of an infirmity of the flesh," *i.e.* on account of sickness. The motives for a journey inland were so obvious that it may be doubted whether S. Paul would not have made it in any case. But an attack of sickness at Perga, which made a visit to the higher country round Antioch desirable, may well have been a contributory motive, as Ramsay suggests, and may have been the final point which led to S. Paul's decision. Such an incident would naturally be regarded as a divine admonition, which could not be ignored.

It is indeed possible that Lightfoot has overstated the necessity of interpreting διά in this case as meaning "on account of" rather than "to the accompaniment of." For somewhat later uses of διά with the accusative in a sense scarcely distinguishable from its use with the genitive see *Voc. Gr. Test. s.v.* It would, however, be unsafe to understand it here in any but a causal sense. The patristic commentators understand the words to refer to persecution, usually, however, translating διά as if it meant "to the accompaniment of." S. Paul might justly have ascribed his visit to Lystra as due to persecution, and have applied the causes of his visit there to the whole of the visit to the Galatian region; such an extension of the circumstances of his visit to one city to all the cities of the region is an exaggeration of which S. Paul is quite capable. But the words cannot be taken naturally to mean anything but bodily weakness.

Further, it is harder to explain the departure of John Mark and his subsequent treatment by S. Barnabas if his departure was simply due to cowardice and not in some way justifiable, while the language of Acts xv. 38 suggests that he had refused some new development of "the work," and not that he had refused to proceed with work already planned. Similarly it is easier to understand his subsequent reconciliation with S. Paul (Col. iv. 10) if his departure was due to scruples which S. Paul could respect when the whole controversy to which they were due was a thing of the past. It was much easier to regard S. Barnabas' visit to Cyprus as an extension of the work he had been commissioned to do in Antioch, than the visit to Antioch in Pisidia as an extension of S. Paul's work in Cilicia. Hence S. Mark, especially as he may have had a personal connection with Cyprus, and was in any case a nephew of S. Barnabas, might naturally agree to the earlier programme but shrink from its proposed extension. That extension was a far greater defiance of the Church of Jerusalem of which he was a member. He was also personally attached to S. Peter, who was to some extent slighted by the new development.

12. Many theories have been built on the introduction of S. Paul's Gentile name at this point. The probable explanation is that S. Luke avoided its introduction until he had completed the section xiii. 4–12, in order to avoid the necessity of bringing on the scene at the same moment two characters with the name Παῦλος.

13. Cf. nn. 4, 11. The route followed on this part of the journey is otherwise unintelligible, the towns visited being of no considerable importance. They were, however, the natural extension of S. Paul's work in Cilicia, and a stepping-stone towards the larger cities of the province of Asia. A direct attempt to evangelize Ephesus would have been an open defiance of Jerusalem; moreover, at this time S. Paul seems not to have seen the possibility of evangelizing only the larger cities, leaving the smaller towns on the main routes to be converted by a process of permeation. He seems to have contemplated only an extension of his Cilician labours, which would provide him with a base for the formation of an Asiatic "diocese," extending from the Syrian Antioch to Ephesus, along the route which in fact he always follows except where he travels by sea in order to gain time (Acts xv. 41, xix. 1, as against xviii. 21 and xx. For this route cf. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 390, Art. "Roads and Travel (in N.T.)."

14. This explanation of his motives is of course only conjectural.

15. Acts xiv. 25, from which it appears that they had not preached in Perga on the occasion of their former visit. This confirms the view advanced in nn. 4 and 11 as to the reasons for the choice of the route. It would be difficult to regard Perga as an extension either of the Churches in Cyprus or of those in Galatia; but absurd to omit it, if the whole journey was a venture into untouched regions, since it lay on the direct route uniting these two groups of Churches. This was so manifest that on their return the Apostles could not resist the temptation to preach there

and so join up the two spheres of missionary labour. To have done so on the first visit would have been to admit that they were acting without any reference to the earlier labours for which they could claim some sort of general recognition from the Church of Jerusalem. On the return journey it would be reasonable to fill in the gap and the action could easily be defended.

It can hardly be supposed that after passing through Perga without preaching they attempted to evangelize the very thinly-civilized region lying between it and the Pisidian Antioch (see note on διέρχομαι).

16. For the Pisidian Antioch cf. Ramsay *s.v.* in Hastings' *D.B.* I. 104, and for more recent discoveries there see the numerous articles on the town in *J.R.S. passim*.

17. Mt. xxiii. 5, *Life and Times*, I. 76, II. 408. It would be impossible for the authorities of a synagogue in the Dispersion to invite any chance traveller to address the Sabbath congregation, and it is to be presumed that the regularity with which S. Paul was invited to do so was due to the fact that his dress proclaimed him as an eminent Rabbi.

18. The speech recorded by S. Luke is hardly to be regarded even as an actual summary of what S. Paul said; it is rather a summary of the sort of things which he was in the habit of saying to an audience of Jews and Gentiles familiar with Judaism, based on speeches actually heard by S. Luke on such occasions. Consequently it is unsafe to connect it with any special set of synagogue lessons. There is a gap in the connection at Acts xiii. 23 due to the compression of the argument, since there should be a statement of the Messianic hope of the nation. This is indeed implied in κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν, and resumed in *vv.* 27, 32, but a fuller treatment is needed in order to make the sequence of thought clear.

19. The historical fact of the Resurrection in *v.* 31 is the centre of the whole argument, and the accuracy of this part of the speech as a sample of S. Paul's method of proving the truth of his message is confirmed by 1 Cor. xv. 1 *seqq.*, where it is clear that the historical fact of the Resurrection has formed a large part of S. Paul's teaching. This is also implied in the familiarity of his converts with the leading members of the Church assumed in this Epistle and Gal. i. 18, 19, ii. 9. This familiarity can only be due to the fact that they have been described as members of the earliest Christian society and witnesses of the Resurrection.

20. Acts xiii. 38. For S. Paul's teaching on this matter cf. c. IV. § i. n. 25. It is of course a fundamental point in his system, but naturally in a preliminary address such as S. Luke is here describing it would only be introduced incidentally.

21. S. Luke clearly implies that the interval between S. Paul's first speech in the synagogue and the sabbath on which the rupture took place was only one week. Possibly he has shortened the actual period between the two events, but there is no necessity for such a supposition. The length of time for which his teaching would be tolerated was bound to depend on the rapidity with which he developed his main theme of the supersession of the Law. In the present case it seems that owing to the favourable reception of his message by the Gentiles and the consequent irritation of the Jews he forced the crisis with the utmost rapidity.

22. The language of Acts xiii. 44 is of course exaggerated beyond need of comment.

23. Cf. c. IV. § i. nn. 56, 57, and the references to the earlier notes given there.

24. Acts xiii. 46. The mention of this solemn turning to the Gentiles raises a certain problem. There are three such cases, here and in xviii. 6 (at Corinth), and xxviii. 25 (at Rome). The reason for the notice of it at Rome is obvious, since it marks the climax of S. Paul's career. It is not, however, clear why S. Luke should mention the matter here and at Corinth, and not elsewhere; it is to be presumed that S. Paul repudiated the synagogue with equal solemnity, wherever he decided to break off from it and continue the Church as a separate organization, as he certainly did at Iconium and Ephesus. It would seem that the fact is mentioned here on the ground that the Pisidian Antioch was the first place at which S. Paul found himself compelled to break with the synagogue, while Corinth marks a new stage in S. Paul's career, since from this point he ceases to be an itinerant missionary and settles down to conduct lengthy campaigns in carefully selected centres (see below, § iii. n. 17). It is in itself probable that the present was the first occasion on which S. Paul had attempted to continue his work in a city after being rejected

by the synagogue. There is no evidence of any breach at the Syrian Antioch (c. v. § i. n. 8), and it is quite reasonable to suppose that hitherto S. Paul had followed the precept of Mt. x. 23 and abandoned his work in any city when faced with rejection by the synagogue. Such a change of policy might well result from the feeling that it was no longer possible to observe such precepts literally; while it is probable that the preservation of the saying of Our Lord is due to the fact that it was quoted by the Hebrew Christians against S. Paul's practice in this and similar cases. His failure to observe the letter of such precepts was one of the grounds of the objections of the Hebrews to S. Paul's methods (cf. c. VII. § iv. n. 8). It is indeed possible that S. Paul had already acted in the same manner in Cilicia, and that S. Luke mentions it here because he has not given a detailed narrative of any previous journey; but it is equally probable that hitherto S. Paul had complied literally with the custom of the older Apostles and abandoned his work in any city when faced in the synagogue with opposition which was too bitter to overcome by persuasion. It cannot indeed be assumed that he was aware of that custom and the saying of Our Lord on which it was based; but, whether consciously or not, he may have observed it in practice.

25. The tolerance of the Roman Empire towards new religions as such was in practice only limited by the necessities of public morality and public order. The primitive idea that Roman citizens might worship only Roman gods, which had inspired the legislation of 424 B.C. (Livy iv. 30) or the suppression of the *Bacchanalia* (*ib.* xxxix. 8 *seqq.*), still survived in theory as is shown by the case of Pomponia Graecina in A.D. 57 (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 32). In any case, however, this theory only applied to Roman citizens and to the erection of temples in the *pomoerium*, while the history of the cult of Isis shows the impossibility of enforcing it. This was suppressed in 58 B.C. by the consuls and we read of three further suppressions in the next ten years. The triumvirs erected a temple in her honour, but Augustus removed it from the city, and later from the suburbs None the less it was necessary for Tiberius in consequence of a scandal to suppress it again, the priests being crucified and the devotees banished. In spite of this there was a shrine on the Capitol at the end of Nero's reign. (For the facts recorded and references cf. Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Government*, pp. 14 *seqq.*) In some ways indeed the city of Rome was more difficult to keep free from religions regarded as immoral in their character than the provinces; thus Augustus prohibited Roman citizens from taking part in the Druid worship in Gaul and Claudius suppressed it, and both measures would seem to have been effective (Suet. *Claud.* 25 and cf. Tert. *Apol.* ix. 1 for the suppression of the sacrifice of children to Moloch in Africa). At this period, however, Christianity had not acquired its later reputation for immorality, and there was no motive for suppressing it on this ground. The laws against unlicensed *collegia* promulgated by Julius Caesar and confirmed by Augustus were scarcely likely to be more serious. They were indeed effective to some extent in Italy as late as A.D. 133, as is shown by the regulations of the burial society at Lanuvium (see Bruns, *Fontes Iuris Romani*, 315). It appears from *Antt.* XIV. x. 8 that the proconsul of Asia was responsible for enforcing the edict of Julius Caesar in his province; for similar action in the provinces cf. Philo, *Adv. Flaccum*, 1 (M. II. 518) (where, however, the action is quoted as evidence of the exceptional efficiency of Flaccus in his first years of office), Pliny, *Ad Tra.* 94, Tert. *Apol.* xxxix. It is, however, impossible to suppose that any systematic attempt to suppress illegal associations was carried out in most provinces. Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 17 shows that illegal *collegia* could in fact exist in Italy, so long as they did not incur the anger of the government by causing any kind of disorder.

Hence it would appear that no action was likely to be taken against S. Paul at Antioch on purely legal grounds for forming a new religious society. On the other hand the position would be changed if the opposition of the Jews to his teaching led to violence. Magistrates were responsible for preserving the peace of the city; and if it was disturbed by riots they would naturally be inclined to deal severely with those responsible for them, if the origin of the riots was due to an action which was in itself illegal. The Church would then be in the position of an illegal *collegium*, whose activities had in fact led to a riot, as in the passage of Tacitus referred to above. It would be easy for S. Paul's opponents to work on the fears

of the local magistrates and persuade them to act before a breach of the peace actually occurred. Without some such legal justification it is hard to see on what grounds the magistrates could be persuaded to take action against the missionaries.

26. Cf. above, c. IV. § i. n. 36. It may be presumed that S. Paul would have argued to this effect before Gallio, had he been allowed to speak. Gentile magistrates would, however, seldom be prepared to listen to the evidence from the O.T. intended to prove that the introduction of Christianity was not the teaching of a new religion but only the true version of Judaism, or at any rate a permissible variation of it. Theologically the argument of Galatians is that Christianity is the only true development of Judaism, Christians being the Ἰσραὴλ Θεοῦ. In his defences before Felix and Agrippa S. Paul naturally only endeavours to prove that Christianity is a legitimate form of the Jewish religion, not an entirely unauthorized and alien religion (Acts xxiv. 14 *seqq.*, where it is particularly noticeable that he represents the collection for the Hebrew Christians as intended for the benefit of the nation, and xxvi. 22 *seqq.*). Since, however, the magistrates of a provincial town would scarcely consent to listen to his arguments, his breach with the synagogue left him in a rather doubtful legal position, if the Jews resorted to violence against him, or were able to gain the ear of the magistrates.

The motives for the later persecutions of the Christians do not of course come into consideration here.

27. Acts xiii. 49. The phrase is only intended to describe the way in which Christianity normally penetrated to outlying regions, and is inserted because this is the first mission of which a full account is given. It can hardly be supposed that any serious number of converts were made outside the city on the occasion of this first visit. It seems unnecessary to find here any technical implication for the word χώρα. See further, n. 37.

28. There is no evidence that the "persecution" amounted to more than an agitation for the expulsion of SS. Paul and Barnabas, the Bezan reading θλίψιν μεγάλην καὶ διωγμον being merely the beginning of conventional hagiology. Ramsay's theory (*S. Paul the Traveller*, p. 106) that one of the three "beatings with rods" of 2 Cor. xi. 25 is to be placed at Antioch seems improbable. S. Luke appears to record all the Apostle's sufferings which fall within the part of his career of which he gives a detailed narrative. The other cases probably fall within his ministry in Cilicia (see c. V. § iii. n. 4). These would be beatings inflicted by officers of the auxiliary troops employed by the subject-princes of Cilicia, and since these forces, like those of Judaea, were sometimes under the command of these princes and sometimes under Roman officials, they would naturally be organized on Roman lines and employ Roman methods of punishment (cf. c. IV. § ii. n. 6). Hence in these regions S. Paul would be in danger of the same kind of treatment as that which he only just escapes in Acts xxii. 24. It is not necessary to suppose that his use of the word ἐρραβδίσθην can only be applied to the Roman civil punishment of beating with rods by the lictors of a Roman colony. He is contrasting beatings inflicted by Gentile authorities with similar punishments inflicted by his fellow-countrymen. In a colony S. Paul would hardly fail to use his privileges as a Roman citizen either to avoid such a punishment or to obtain redress for it; and S. Luke would hardly fail to record the matter as he has done in the case of Philippi.

29. For the view that the route followed on this journey is only intelligible as an extension of an existing Cilician "diocese" see nn. 4, 13. The return along the same route is equally hard to understand, unless it was necessitated by the fact that S. Paul had been forced to leave Antioch and Iconium before he could provide the local Churches with presbyters to supervise their growth. He would naturally feel bound to do so before returning to Syria, since he could not tell how long he might be detained there. Otherwise we should expect him to continue his journey by land to Tarsus and the Syrian Antioch.

The view that S. Paul had already evangelized the towns of Cilicia as far as the frontier of the province of Galatia is to some extent confirmed by his delay in the regions adjoining Lystra and Derbe (see n. 32). Had he not already done so, it would seem natural for him to extend his journey as far as Laranda and to return thence to Iconium. If, however, he had already evangelized Cilicia as far as the

frontier of Galatia, it would be natural for him not to proceed further with his journey, but to wait at Derbe until it was safe to return to Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch. There could be no great need for him to revisit his Cilician Churches, since his mission in these regions had extended over a period of eleven years.

30. For Iconium cf. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* II. 443 *s.v.* It appears from Acts xiv. 1 that there was a synagogue here, while none are mentioned at Lystra and Derbe, as is natural in view of the greater importance of the city. Schürer (*G.J.V.* III. 19) regards the local legend of Annakos or Nannakos as an adoption of the Jewish legend of Enoch, in which case there must have been a considerable Jewish element in the population, tending to be merged among the Gentiles of the district. This suits the account of S. Timothy's upbringing at Lystra. The story in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* that S. Paul was intending to proceed direct to Lystra, but was diverted as the result of a chance meeting with Onesiphorus, can hardly be true. Iconium was a larger city than Lystra and had more Jews in it, and the *détour* was in the circumstances the natural way to take. Moreover Lystra was a colony and in close touch with its sister-colony of Antioch (cf. Ramsay, *Galatians*, 224), and it is likely that S. Paul would prefer to leave an interval between his departure from Antioch and his arrival at Lystra in case the local magistrates should have been warned against troublesome visitors. Consequently the legend in this point cannot be regarded as based on fact, although some details, such as the queen Tryphaena, are historical, and the writer is correct in saying that the road from the Pisidian Antioch to Cilicia ran direct to Lystra, and that the visit to Iconium represents a deviation from it.

31. This seems to be the implication of Acts xiv. 5. The magistrates could hardly take part in an ὁρμή on the part of the Jews and the Gentile mob with the object of stoning the Apostles. They could, however, promise unofficially to connive at it, and leave the Jews and their supporters a free hand. The stoning would be regarded by the Jews as a perfectly legal action, similar to that attempted in Lk. iv. 29, while the Gentile magistrates would regard it as a piece of mob-violence. For the privileges enjoyed by Jewish communities of the Dispersion cf. c. II. n. 44 and below, § iv. n. 20 and § v. n. 27. They certainly would not include the right to inflict the death-penalty, and at a comparatively small city such as Iconium they would probably be very few indeed, especially as against a Roman citizen. It would not, however, be known that S. Paul was possessed of this citizenship, unless he had made the fact public, and there is no evidence that he was faced at Iconium with the necessity of doing so. In this case it would be most unlikely that his death in a local riot at the hands of his fellow-countrymen would give rise to any serious inquiry by the provincial authorities.

32. The wording of Acts xiv. 6 is peculiar. It implies that the Apostles in view of the danger at Iconium do not simply proceed to Lystra and thence to Derbe, but that they spend their time between the two. That they attempted any serious work in the country district of Lycaonia lying between Lystra and Derbe is very improbable. They did not apparently understand the local Lycaonian dialect, since they did not intervene in the attempt to offer sacrifices to them until the preparations for it were far advanced (*v.* 11, from which it appears that the interpretation of what the crowd actually said was due to subsequent conjecture); otherwise they would have been bound to protest at once. In any case we cannot suppose that they would understand so obscure a language. Since, however, the Lycaonian speech was that used by the populace of Lystra, it would presumably be still more the language of the peasants and slaves of the rural districts. The natural interpretation is that they spent the time between the two cities, without making their residence permanently in either. The reasons suggested in the text for their doing so are supported by the fact that S. Luke connects their action closely with the discovery of the plot against them on the part of the Jews of Iconium.

That the change of plans involved the spending of a winter in this district seems fairly clear. The travelling season must by this time have been very far advanced, and it would scarcely be safe to undertake a long journey even by land in these regions (cf. Ramsay in *J.R.S.* VII. ii. 241). Further, the ease with which the Apostles are able to revisit the cities from which they had been expelled not long before, though due in part to the comparative secrecy of these visits, is probably also to be

explained by the fact that the municipal authorities responsible for their expulsion were no longer in office. (This is Ramsay's view, and seems certainly correct.) For Lystra and Derbe cf. Ramsay, *Galatians*, 223 *seqq.*, and the articles in Hastings' *D.B.* III. 178 (Lystra) and I. 595 (Derbe). In them and the surrounding country the Apostles would find a suitable refuge (κατέφυγον), on account of their small size and the paucity of Jewish inhabitants.

33. That the news of S. Paul's presence at Lystra was conveyed to Iconium and Antioch by the reports as to the incident of the healing and the apotheosis is only a conjecture. If, however, the wording of *v.* 6 has been correctly interpreted above it seems probable. There is no mention of a synagogue at Lystra, and from the fact that S. Timothy's mother married a Gentile and that her son was uncircumcised it looks as though the Jews there were few in number and tending to fall away from their religion (cf. above, c. I. n. 50). This explains the absence of opposition among the local Jews and also suggests that apart from rumours of the affair of the cripple the Jews of Antioch and Iconium would not have been able to trace the Apostles to Lystra. Naturally, however, the discovery might have been made in other ways.

34. Cf. c. II. n. 41. If the order of the narrative in Acts xiv. 19 is correct, the Jews stoned S. Paul before dragging him out of the city, although they should have done the opposite. This might easily happen if the whole proceeding took place in the course of a riot in the street, as the Lucan narrative suggests, and as was apparently intended at Iconium (n. 31). Presumably they dragged him out afterwards to make up for the previous omission to do so.

35. At Derbe, as at Lystra, we hear no mention of a synagogue or of work among the Jews. The inference is that there were too few to form a synagogue, if there were any at all.

36. See n. 32. The change of magistrates would make the visits to Iconium and Antioch safer. In any case, however, the object of the Apostles was to complete the organization of the communities up to a point at which they could be safely left in the hands of local presbyters, and not to undertake fresh missionary work on a large scale. This would not expose the Apostles to the same risk of persecution, since the visit need not be known to the Jews or the magistrates. It is to be observed that we never hear of any persecutions on the occasion of S. Paul's second visits to his Churches; the only places where any difficulty occurs in connection with such visits are Thessalonica, where an unspecified obstacle for a time prevented his return (see below, § v. n. 11), Ephesus, where, however, the Church was not founded till the second visit and no controversy was excited by the short first visit of Acts xviii. 19, and Corinth, where the length of the visit recorded in Acts xx. 2 rendered it impossible for his presence to be concealed. Hence on this occasion the Jews were able to plot his assassination during the voyage to Syria. Otherwise the visits of S. Paul to his Churches after their foundation are always peaceful, a fact which can hardly be explained except by the view that they were private in character and not known outside Christian circles.

37. The words of Acts xiv. 22 imply that the Churches were actually suffering persecution at the time of the second visit. They might indeed be discounted as simply conventional and intended to show the sort of message S. Paul would normally deliver on the occasion of such a second visit, but they are confirmed by Gal. vi. 12. See below, § ii. n. 6, which implies a certain amount of Jewish persecution. At this period it is not likely that the persecution at the hands of the Gentiles was more serious than that to which the converts of non-Jewish origin would have been liable if they had joined the synagogue.

ἡμᾶς here is very difficult to understand, except on the supposition that the author of the sections xvi. 10 *seqq.* and xx. 5 to the end of the book was actually present at an address delivered by S. Paul in one of these cities on the occasion of this journey. The use of the first person in a general sense is without parallel in his narrative, while his personal appearances and disappearances, as marked by the first person, are so sudden that it would be easy for him to indicate by its use in this one verse that he was in fact present on such an occasion. In itself there is nothing improbable in the supposition that he was a Gentile of Antioch in Pisidia, who was converted after S. Paul's departure, and met him for the first time on his

second journey, possibly as the result of the dispersion of the Gospel δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας. In this case we should have an explanation of the apparently unnecessary remark as to the diffusion of the Gospel in the regions round Antioch. It is of course possible that the writer has simply fallen into a general use of the first person as a result of his own experience of persecution at the time of writing; but it is more in keeping with the author's usual method to suppose that he uses the first person because he is recording a genuine personal reminiscence. (The earlier appearance of the first person at xi. 28 is of course not genuine. It belongs to the quite unreliable series of additions to the text made by a writer entirely incapable of understanding either S. Luke's methods or the events which he narrates. In xi. 28 the first person plural appears in conjunction with the monumental ineptitude of ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις, on which see c. v. § ii. n. 6.)

38. For the presbyterate in the Hebrew communities outside Jerusalem see c. III. § ii. n. 17. It must be remembered that in S. Paul's view the Church only existed as a separate organization from the synagogue owing to the failure of the latter body to avail itself of the opportunity of accepting the Gospel, which he had presented to it, and its consequent loss of the claim to be the representative of the true Israel. Consequently he would inevitably tend to model the new and only genuine community of the true Israel on the lines of the body which had through its own fault been rejected. Hence the organization of the synagogue would reappear in the Christian communities of the Gentiles no less than among those of Palestine.

At the Syrian Antioch indeed there is no mention of any presbyters. This is possibly due to mere accident. It is, however, more probable that presbyters were not regarded as necessary in a society in which there was a group of resident Christians with such high qualifications as the persons mentioned in Acts xiii. 1. Two of these claimed to be Apostles and could show some kind of claim to have received definite authority from the Church of Jerusalem; of the rest some may have seen the Lord in the flesh; all were in any case "prophets" distinguished by their spiritual gifts. On the other hand they were not, as at Jerusalem, so numerous that it was felt to be necessary as yet to select from those with such qualifications a certain number to be formally recognized as teachers and rulers of the Church (c. v. § ii. nn. 30 *seqq.*). Hence it is quite possible that it was not felt necessary to appoint presbyters, since there was a body of leaders of undisputed pre-eminence, large enough to manage the affairs of the community, but not too large for corporate action.

On the other hand in the local Churches of Galatia there were none who could claim to have seen the Lord in the flesh; and it would be obviously unsafe for the Apostles, after a visit of only a few weeks' duration, to entrust the Churches to those who had happened to show the most aptitude for the external display of spiritual gifts. The functions of these presbyters vary in different Epistles, a fact which is not surprising in view of the different situations with which S. Paul has to deal and the differences of local conditions. Thus in Gal. vi. 6 we find persons responsible for the instruction of new converts and entitled to their support, although apparently they find some difficulty in obtaining it. On the other hand they are never appealed to in support of his teaching as against that of his opponents. This is not unnatural. The presbyters of these Churches would inevitably be chosen in the first instance from among the Jewish converts, and would have to face the severest persecution, while they would naturally not be so enthusiastic for freedom from the Law as the Gentiles. Hence in the presence of Jewish Christians of Hebrew origin and of high standing in the Church they would easily tend to fall away from S. Paul's teaching; and it is likely that the presbyters of the Galatian Churches were themselves among those who were wavering in their allegiance. Naturally S. Paul cannot simply appeal to them to uphold his doctrine.

In 1 Thess. v. 12 we find recognized rulers (προϊστάμενοι) who are responsible for the discipline and presumably for the general instruction of the Church. They seem to find some difficulty in maintaining their authority. At the same time there seems to be far more exercise of discipline at Thessalonica than in Galatia; thus here alone S. Paul finds it necessary to insist on a due liberty for the exercise of spiritual gifts (*v.* 19). It would seem that the rulers are endeavouring both to exercise too strict a control over the meetings of the Church and also to extend

their moral authority over the other converts—and meeting with some opposition in the process. It seems reasonable to identify these "rulers" with the Galatian "teachers," and to suppose that in both cases we are dealing with presbyters, whose position varies in accordance with their personal qualities and the local conditions of the Churches. It is only natural to suppose that they are responsible for the conduct of worship and preside at the common meals and the Eucharist in the absence of the Apostles. S. Paul's silence is due to the fact that he has no reason for mentioning this side of the Christian life in either case.

For the question whether there were originally presbyters at Corinth see below, § v. n. 41.

It is natural that the position of the presbyters, originally appointed to supervise public worship, but also possessing a vague moral authority, analogous though inferior in scope to that of the elders of the Jewish synagogue of the Dispersion, should tend to develop, as the Church grew in numbers, more especially when their position was enhanced by the decline of visible spiritual gifts. While such gifts were still common their possessors would inevitably eclipse the more prosaic presbyters. This stage meets us in *Didache* xv, a passage which is probably true to the actual facts in Palestine at this period, even if the work be of later origin. So in its origin Montanism is a reaction in favour of alleged spiritual gifts as against the authority of the local presbyters (*H.E.* v. 16). The position of the presbyters is, however, firmly established in 1 Peter v. 1 and in the Pastoral Epistles, and the process by which it was established was probably in all cases a very brief one. In the first instance, however, their duties would be more concerned with presiding at public worship and the Eucharist and instructing new converts than with the general government of the community. The influence of persons possessed of spiritual gifts would be very strong, as long as these lasted, and would tend to diminish the influence of less striking personalities. Further, the first presbyters would almost inevitably be Jews or proselytes of long standing, and any undue claim to exercise authority over the newly emancipated Gentiles might have led to disaster; and so long as the judaistic controversy lasted S. Paul might naturally shrink from giving them an undue importance in the new communities. Hence he does not in his letters simply appeal to them to exercise their authority and only alludes to them incidentally.

With regard to the method of their appointment it is clear that the words *χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς* mean "appointing for them" not "causing them to elect." The word *χειροτονεῖν* has by this time lost all sense of popular voting, as is clear from Acts x. 41 (cf. *Antt.* vi. iv. 2, xiii. ii. 2, xx. i. 3, Philo, *De Joseph.* 41 (M. ii. 76), *De Carit.* 2 (M. ii. 385), *De Praem. et Poen.* 9 (M. ii. 417), *Adv. Flacc.* 13 (M. ii. 533), etc. In view of S. Paul's essentially autocratic temperament and the inexperience of the converts, it is unlikely that he would appoint them in any other way than by direct nomination.

39. Cf. n. 15.

40. Cf. n. 4. In confirmation of the point that the report to the Church at the end of a journey is a kind of official completion of it and is regarded as such by S. Luke it may be noted that the reception of S. Paul and his companions in Acts xxi. 18 is clearly distinct from the unofficial welcome by the brethren mentioned in the preceding verse.

NOTE ON THE MEANING OF *διέρχομαι*

Ramsay holds that this word as used in the Acts connotes in certain cases the idea of "going on a missionary journey through" a given district; his view is accepted by Kirsopp Lake in *E.E.P.* 301 and noted by Moulton and Milligan in *Voc. Gr. Test. s.v.*, where, however, no parallel usage is quoted. At the risk of differing from such authorities it is necessary to

point out that there is no evidence in support of this connotation in the Acts at all. The word occurs in the following passages.

viii. 4. *διῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον.*
viii. 40. *διερχόμενος εὐηγγελίζετο τὰς πόλεις.*
ix. 32. *διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων.*
x. 38. *διῆλθεν εὐεργετῶν.*
xi. 19. *διῆλθον ἕως Φοινίκης...μηδενὶ λαλοῦντες...εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις.*
xii. 10. *διελθόντες πρώτην φυλακήν.*
xiii. 6. *διελθόντες ὅλην τὴν νῆσον.*
xiii. 14. *διελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Πέργης.*
xiv. 24. *διελθόντες τὴν Πισιδίαν.*
xv. 3. *διήρχοντο τὴν Φοινίκην...ἐκδιηγούμενοι.*
xv. 41. *διήρχετο τὴν Συρίαν ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς ἐκκλησίας.*
xvi. 6. *διῆλθον τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν.*
xvii. 23. *διερχόμενος τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν.*
xviii. 23. *διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γ. χώραν καὶ Φ. στηρίζων.*
xviii. 27. *διελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαίαν.*
xix. 1. *διελθόντα τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη.*
xix. 21. *διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαίαν.*
xx. 2. *διελθὼν τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα.*
xx. 25. *διῆλθον κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν.*

To these passages may be added 1 Cor. x. 1, xvi. 5, and 2 Cor. i. 16.

Now in three of these passages the word means "going up and down" rather than "going through on a missionary journey." These are x. 38, xvii. 23 and xx. 25. In the first and last the action is accompanied by religious activities which are specified in each case. In xvii. 23 there is no such connotation; and we may equally exclude xii. 10 and xviii. 27. In six of the remaining instances the act of "going through" is accompanied by religious activities expressed by the addition of words to describe its character. These are viii. 4 and 40, xi. 19 (where the nature is implied in *μηδενὶ λαλοῦντες*), xv. 3 and 41, and xviii. 23. It is to be observed that S. Luke in these cases has distinguished between two kinds of activity which can accompany a journey, namely the evangelization of a new region and the confirmation of already existing Churches.

We have eight cases left. Three of these, and also the three passages in the Corinthian Epistles, if the word implies any religious activity, connote that of confirmation, not that of evangelization, since they refer to regions already evangelized, namely, ix. 32, where S. Peter is visiting the Saints, not conducting a mission, and xix. 21 and xx. 2, where S. Paul is visiting Macedonia and Achaia, which had been evangelized some years before. But of the five left two cancel one another, namely, xiii. 14 and xiv. 24, since, if the first journey was a visit of evangelization, the second was a visit of confirmation. The two activities are entirely distinct, and a journey conducted with one object in view would differ widely from one undertaken for the opposite purpose (see n. 36). S. Luke is careful to distinguish the two kinds of journey in the instances quoted above, and it is impossible to suppose that the word can be applied indifferently to either form of

activity. In point of fact the journey led through a singularly ill-populated region, and it is incredible that S. Paul, having omitted Perga on his first visit, should trouble to evangelize the countryside that lay between it and the Pisidian Antioch.

We are now reduced to three instances. There is no reason for supposing that the journey through Cyprus was a missionary journey. The object of it was primarily to organize the labours of the Hellenist refugees and there is no evidence that they had had any influence outside the synagogues. Ramsay endeavours to read into the words ὅλην τὴν νῆσον the implication that the Apostles conducted a complete evangelization of the places along the road from Salamis to Paphos. In itself it would be improbable that they would make the attempt, since the towns of Cyprus lay on the coast; while the language of Acts xiii. 6 seems naturally to mean that the Apostles went by road from Salamis at one end of the island to Paphos at the other instead of travelling round it by sea.

In xvi. 6 we are dealing with S. Paul's journey through the border-region of Phrygia and Galatia from the Pisidian Antioch or Iconium to Dorylaeum on the border of Bithynia. This district is, as Harnack notes, singularly devoid of towns, and there is no evidence that S. Paul preached in it. That he did so is only to be inferred from the mistaken view that S. Luke is referring to the same region in xviii. 23, where he describes a visit of confirmation to the "Galatian and Phrygian country." But here he is referring to a journey to the Galatian Churches and Phrygia, which ends in S. Paul's arrival at Ephesus. Strictly the process of confirmation ends when he leaves Galatia, as Phrygia had not been evangelized yet; but in any case we are dealing here with a quite different region from that referred to in xvi. 6 (see below, § ii, note on Galatia).

In xix. 1 the journey recorded may have been accompanied by missionary work, but the probabilities are against it. It probably led S. Paul through Colossae and Laodicea (see below, c. vii. § i. n. 31), and in this case it is certain that there was no such work, since he was unknown to the Christians of those towns.

The point is of some importance, since the unsupported belief that the word connotes missionary activity has led to various errors as to S. Paul's career, based on the view that wherever S. Luke records a journey by the use of this word we are bound to allow time for a journey accompanied by preaching and the founding of Churches.

§ ii. THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM

For a certain period the Apostles were able to rest themselves from the labours of their journey at Antioch. The news of their return took some time to penetrate to Jerusalem, owing to the strained relations which had existed between the two bodies since the visit of Peter. As soon, however, as the account of their appeal to the Gentile world reached the Mother-Church it provoked a vigorous reaction[1]. The Hebrew Christians put forward without any qualification the claim that Gentile converts could not be saved without circumcision, a claim which exceeded anything hitherto made by them, though expressing the ultimate issue involved in the whole controversy[2]. Further, it was supported by vigorous propaganda conducted by Jewish emissaries, who carried their teaching throughout the communities founded outside Judaea. Their action had not received any authoritative sanction from the Church of Jerusalem, where the position of James was too strong to allow the body as a whole to commit itself to the view that there was any serious value in the enforcement on the Gentiles of a reduced form of Judaism[3]. On the other hand the exponents of popular Judaism counted among their number many whose qualifications to the respect of the Church were in no way inferior to those of any Christian outside the ranks of the Twelve. This fact together with the prestige attaching to the Church of Jerusalem and the doubts which they could easily cast on the credentials of the leaders of the Antiochene movement rendered them formidable adversaries[4].

At Antioch indeed, and among the more solidly established communities of Cilicia, there was perhaps comparatively little danger that such doctrines would meet with any general acceptance. None the less the open contradiction between two groups of Christian teachers, both of the highest standing, was bound to produce a considerable amount of unsettlement. Among the newer communities the effect was disastrous[5]. The prestige and vigour of the Hebrew missionaries produced a wholesale abandonment of the teaching of Paul in favour of that put forward by the newcomers. Among these converts were many who had been proselytes of Judaism before they had heard the Gospel, while others were of Jewish origin themselves. The new doctrine offered an easy escape from the persecution they had to face from the orthodox Jews, who were not likely to object to the claims of Christianity so long as it remained a sect of Judaism accepting the Law as observed by the Jews of the synagogues of the Dispersion

and their proselytes[6]. On the other hand Paul's readiness to waive the demand for circumcision was represented as due to his desire to attract Gentile converts by preaching an easy Gospel demanding no sacrifice from his followers, instead of the full religion of Christianity[7]. They were not indeed called on to sacrifice anything that he had taught them but only to supply what he had left defective. Thus the Gentiles were asked to make the sacrifice of accepting circumcision, and with it the less onerous points of the Law, such as the observance of the sabbath, which the Jewish proselyte was expected to keep[8].

The crisis was too serious for Paul to return at once to his converts, much as he would have desired to do so, since it was necessary to obtain a formal decision of the Church, which would finally settle the issue. If the party of circumcision intended to carry their campaign into the new Churches, it would be impossible for him to prevent them intervening at any point to upset the result of his labours. Further the tendency of the new converts to accept his opponents' views might well undo the whole gain which the recent journey had been intended to secure. If the new Gentile converts accepted Judaism without hesitation, the main argument against the enforcement of full proselytism on all Gentile Christians was gone[9]. Accordingly it was decided that the two Apostles should travel to Jerusalem on a formal mission to discuss the whole question with the Apostles and the presbyters of the Church[10]. In this way it might be hoped to overcome the difficulty. The two leading Apostles and James had previously been inclined to accept the Pauline position, and it was probable that in the last resort they would maintain that attitude. Peter had indeed upheld the view that the Gentiles need not be circumcised even on the occasion of his visit to Antioch, while James was hardly likely to adopt the view that circumcision by itself had any value[11]. Paul and Barnabas were accompanied on their journey by a certain number of delegates from Antioch, whose presence would to some extent counteract the inevitable preponderance of the Hebrew Christians in any deliberations that might be held in Jerusalem[12].

At the same time it was essential to avert the threatened defection of the new communities. For this purpose Paul wrote in urgent haste a letter in which he opposed to the prestige of his opponents his own claim to have received the Apostolate by a direct divine revelation[13]. If this was not enough to prove that his insistence on the freedom of Gentile Christians from the Law was an integral part of the Gospel he was commissioned to preach, and not a mere attempt

to win the favour of his hearers, he could point out that his teaching had in fact not merely the authority of divine revelation, but also the formal consent of the leading authorities of the Church. Unsatisfactory as their attitude had been, and little as they were able to control their followers, yet they had formally committed themselves to a complete recognition of his authority as the Apostle of the Gentiles[14]. The failure of Peter to adhere to his principles on the occasion of his visit to Antioch could not be urged as an argument against his formal pledge, especially as his action had been repudiated by the Church of Antioch[15]. From this Paul proceeded to a statement of the arguments on which his teaching was based. The Law had never been able to confer righteousness on those who kept it, whereas Christ did enable those who believed in Him to attain to righteousness. To insist on the observance of the Law by Christians was in fact to imply that Christ did not enable the believer to rise above sin[16]. A further vindication of his claims lay in the fact that the gift of the Spirit, never bestowed on the Jews as the result of observing the Law, had been bestowed on the Galatians at their conversion, a proof that the new dispensation had powers which were unknown to the old[17]. This superiority of the new dispensation was foreshadowed in the fact that the original Messianic promise had been made to Abraham on account of his faith, not on account of his observance of the Law; and his true children were those who believed in Christ, not those who observed the Law[18]. The possible argument that the Law itself was the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham was forestalled by a somewhat remarkable rabbinical argument, of a kind calculated to impress Paul's Hebrew opponents with its subtlety, but dependent for its value entirely on the traditional Jewish methods of exegesis. The promise made to Abraham was a promise of a blessing, namely, righteousness, to be attained by faith; but the Law was a Law of works, and brought with it only the curse threatened against those who disobeyed it. From that curse, to which all were subject, the Christian was redeemed by the death of Christ on the Cross, a death to which a special curse was attached in the Law. Moreover, the Law could not be the blessing promised by God to Abraham; for the promise was made by God directly and in His own person to a single descendant of Abraham. For the giving of the Law on the other hand a mediator, namely, Moses, was necessary, in order to bring together the two parties concerned. For neither of the parties concerned in the giving of the Law was a single person who could act directly and without a mediator; the

Law was ordained through the agency of angels and given to the whole people; hence the necessity for the intervention of Moses[19].

The Law then was not the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham, but a means of keeping the sins of the Jewish nation in check until the time had come for the fulfilment of the promise. That came with Christ, in Whom the seed of Abraham passed from the position of children, subject to the tutorship of the Law, into that of adopted sons, who were free[20]. From this argument Paul turned aside to an appeal to his converts not to return from the higher stage of development, to which he had called them, to a lower one, and also to remind them of the enthusiasm with which they had in the first instance received him[21]. A further rabbinical argument identified his opponents from Jerusalem with the children of Hagar, who though children according to the flesh were destined never to receive the true adoption. They were condemned to bondage by the Law given on Mount Sinai, the home of the Ishmaelites, which they fondly supposed to be the scene of the true revelation of God. Their city was only the earthly Jerusalem, which they supposed to be the centre of the earth. Thus their view was limited to the bondage of the world: but the children of the spirit, who were promised the adoption of sons, were to be gathered from the wilderness of heathendom, to be children not of the earthly Jerusalem, but of the Jerusalem from above, which was to be revealed from heaven[22].

His final argument against his opponents was that the Law was valueless unless the whole of it was observed, and in fact his opponents did not do so. Circumcision was useless by itself; and even a perfect observance of the whole Law could not produce righteousness, which could only be found in Christ. The very fact of his persecution proved the truth of his message. It was those who taught circumcision who sought to escape persecution by pleasing men and so avoiding the offence which the preaching of the Crucifixion was bound to give[23]. At the same time he reminded his converts that the freedom to which they were called was not a freedom to do as they pleased, but the freedom of the spirit, which could leave in them no desire to follow the sins of the Gentiles. At their conversion they had passed out of the natural into the spiritual life, and the desires of the old life could not affect them any longer[24]. After a practical exhortation to generosity to those who fell into sin, and to liberality to the officers of the Church responsible for their instruction[25], the letter closed with a final attack on the motives of those who tried to impose the Law on the Gentiles in order to conciliate Jewish opinion[26].

Such was the letter which Paul sent in extreme haste[27] to the Churches which he had so recently founded, when he heard of their threatened desertion to the side of his opponents. The letter was written before the arrangements for the formal visit to Jerusalem were concluded, and so urgent did the matter appear that Paul did not even delay its despatch until he could add to its weight by uniting to his own name that of Barnabas. Its strength lay rather in its vigorous assertion of his personal authority, and his emphatic denial that the observance of the Law had any value as a means of enabling the observer to attain to righteousness—a matter on which Paul as a Pharisee could claim to speak with a greater authority than his opponents—than in its theological arguments. From the point of view of his opponents it failed to meet the main issue. That issue was the necessity of providing some guarantee that the new converts would observe that moral code which the Church had inherited from Judaism. The obvious course to take was to enforce on them the Law, which Jewish experience showed was the one effective means for preserving the nation from the vices of the heathen. And on this point Paul could only reply that those who had received the Spirit would not in fact fulfil the lusts of the flesh, if they were true to the first faith which had led to their conversion. On the other hand it was arguable that in fact this would not happen, but that men who had only recently been converted from the blackest vices of the heathen would be in danger of relapsing without the moral support of the Law. The danger was undeniable, and subsequent experience was to make its reality felt. Paul, however, argued from his own experience of the effect of his conversion, without reflecting that others might not be affected in the same way, especially if they had not had the benefit of a previous training in the strictest form of Jewish morality[28]. Thus the ultimate question was bound to depend on his claim that the Law in fact had proved a failure, and could not produce that righteousness which it was intended to achieve, and the counter-claim that Christianity by a conversion of the whole nature could and did in practice produce such a righteousness[29].

After sending off this letter Paul proceeded to Jerusalem with Barnabas and the rest of the delegates. They travelled by land, and on the course of their journey they made every use of the opportunity which it offered of arousing the support of the non-Jewish Christians of Palestine. The Churches of Phoenicia and Samaria learnt with enthusiasm of the conversion of the Gentiles, since it involved the termination of the Jewish predominance in the Church[30]. These

communities derived their knowledge of the faith from the same movement which had led to the foundation of the Church of Antioch, and naturally sympathised with its teaching. Further, even the common bond of Christianity was not strong enough to overcome the racial antipathies which prevailed on the borders of the actual territory of Judaea. The claim of Jerusalem to predominance in the Church could only appear to the Christians of these parts as a manifestation of the national exclusiveness, which was a perpetual cause of friction; while the close alliance between the Church and Judaism was bound to involve all Christians in such districts in persecution at the hands of their neighbours. Thus the news of a large increase in the Gentile element in the Church was greeted with enthusiasm; and this enthusiasm was likely to be of some value to the Apostles in their dealings with the Hebrew Christians[31].

At Jerusalem the two missionaries and their colleagues were received by a gathering which included both the Twelve and the representatives of the Church of Jerusalem, consisting of James, and the presbyters, and other leading Christians[32]. To this assembly Paul and Barnabas rendered an account of their mission to the Gentiles, treating their hearers as the representatives of the whole Christian society and therefore possessing the right to receive a report of the labours of those whom they were in the last resort responsible for sending out. In this way it was possible to avoid any actual raising of the question of the authority on which they had acted in conducting the mission, unless the Hebrew Christians insisted upon raising it. The difficulty was also obscured by the fact that the latest mission could be represented as a continuation of work initiated by the direct commission of the Church of Jerusalem[33].

At this point events played into Paul's hands. It was inevitable that the question of the relation of Gentile converts to the Law should be fought out at the meeting; and the majority of those present were utterly opposed to the Pauline attitude. But the opposition was voiced in the first instance not by the leaders of the party which stood for the observance of the popular standard of Judaism, but by the Pharisee converts. These converts were held in the highest veneration by the ordinary Christians of Jerusalem on account of their eminence in the observance of the Law, and might have been expected to take a leading part in the demand for the circumcision of the new converts[34]. This indeed they did. On the other hand they saw no value in demanding their circumcision, if it was merely to involve the lax observance of the Law prevalent in Palestine, and

still more among the Jews and proselytes of the Dispersion. Such a method of keeping the Law was worthless, and the Pharisees, whether Jewish or Christian, were not prepared to support proselytism on such terms. The demand put forward by the Pharisee converts was that the Gentile Christians should not only be circumcised but also commanded to observe the whole Mosaic system as interpreted by the Pharisees[35].

So sweeping a demand could not meet with the support of the Hebrew Christians, since it involved them no less than the new converts in a system of obligations which they had always refused to accept, in spite of their respect for others who felt themselves able to do so. It was in fact the same demand as that which Paul had already put forward in his letter to his converts as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole position of his opponents. Even among the Apostles there were only two who were not by implication censured by the new demand, one of them being Paul himself, and the other James the Lord's brother. The demand was not put forward with any serious expectation that it would be accepted, but rather with the characteristic contempt of the extremist for those less logical than himself.

Apparently (though this cannot be regarded as certain) the new demand raised so much confusion that the matter was referred to a later meeting at which it could be discussed more fully[36]. From a tactical point of view the new demand of the Pharisees had immeasurably strengthened Paul and Barnabas, since it transferred the issue from the plain question of the liability of the Gentiles to the Law to the far more complicated one of the nature of the observance of the Law binding on all, whether Jews or Gentiles. The discussion of the matter was naturally vigorous. At length Peter rose and urged that the matter was really decided. As far as the Gentiles were concerned the case of Cornelius showed that it was possible for them to be cleansed by their faith, without any previous observance of the Law in the matter of circumcision[37]. If they could be cleansed from sin by their faith in this way it was manifestly impossible to urge that they stood in need of that ceremonial purity, which it was the object of the Pharisaic system to attain at the expense of a burden which had in the past proved intolerable to all but a trifling minority of the nation.

He was followed by Paul and Barnabas who urged in their support the fact that the manifestations of supernatural approval, given in the case of Cornelius, had their exact counterpart in the signs and

wonders wrought by God as a token of His approval of their work among the Gentiles[38]. At this point James intervened. He was the natural leader of the Pharisees[39], but it was hardly to be expected that he would support their demand, since he had for long been accustomed to accept that far less rigid observance of the Law, which was customary among his fellow-Christians. On the other hand he was not likely to support the demand of the party of circumcision for a standard of partial observance on the part of the Gentile converts. In fact his proposal was of the nature of a compromise. He accepted to the full the labours of Paul and Barnabas. The prophets had seen that the Jewish religion was imperfect and foretold that it would one day be brought to a state of complete perfection, which would lead the whole of mankind to seek the Lord aright. The fulfilment of the prophecy had come, and, as long as the Gentiles understood that the new method of seeking after God included that complete severance from the religions of the Gentiles which was inculcated by the Law, it was unnecessary to impose on them the whole of the older system, which had been expounded to the Gentiles for generations without success[40]. He proposed therefore the issue of a formal statement ordering them to abstain from idolatry and the sins which accompanied it, and also from the use of meats prohibited by the Law[41]. The use of such meats at the common meals of the Church would cause grave difficulties among mixed communities, since Jewish Christians could not eat them without incurring ceremonial uncleanness and violating their consciences.

The proposal of James involved the collapse of the two parties which stood for the Jewish point of view. He would not support his fellow-Pharisees, but if the Law in its strict sense was to be abandoned, he was not prepared to insist on any partial observance, except in so far as it might be necessary in order to avoid shocking the susceptibilities of Jewish Christians. The matter of food was important since it affected the common meals of the Church, but in other matters the Pauline position was ratified, that circumcision was useless unless it was accompanied by the observance of the Law in its rigid form, and that it was absurd to expect this of Gentiles. The solid objection of Paul's opponents that the Gentile converts could not be relied on to abandon the vices of heathenism unless they were compelled, by submitting to circumcision, to separate themselves entirely from their past view of life and to make a formal submission to the moral law of Judaism, was met by a definite proclamation of the necessity of abandoning idolatry and the immoralities of heathen-

ism which had the sanction of religion. Paul would probably have preferred to trust the spiritual development of his converts rather than to issue a formal proclamation, but he could hardly object to a proposal which gave him the essentials of victory. The proposal found unanimous acceptance, the weight of the leaders of the Church, in view of their unanimity, being too strong for any effective opposition. As a pledge of the willingness of the Church to accept the Pauline view of the position of the Gentiles, the letter conveying the decision of the Church to Antioch was entrusted to two leading members of the Church of Jerusalem, chosen to represent respectively the Hebrew and Hellenist elements, Judas Barsabbas and Silas[42]. The letter emphatically repudiated the action of the teachers of the party of circumcision in disturbing the faith of the converts of the Pauline Churches, and spoke with the warmest commendation of the two Apostles of the Gentiles. Apart from the necessity of the points raised by James, the converts were declared to be free from the burden of observing the Law. In all the essentials the victory of Paul was complete.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI, SECTION II

1. The period spent by the Apostles at Antioch on their return cannot have been of very long duration and probably only represents the time taken by the news to filter through from Antioch to Jerusalem. This may have been a matter of two or three months, as the Churches were not apparently in direct relations with one another. How far there was any general communication between local Churches at this period, apart from the activities of individual Christians, is a point on which we have no direct evidence; it would seem that there was normally none.

2. It is significant that the Hebrews according to Acts xv. 1 raise a far more sweeping demand than on previous occasions. In Acts xi. 3 and Gal. ii. 12 the claim implied is that Jews may not eat with Gentile converts. The stiffening of the demand may with some probability be attributed to the more open challenge to the position of the Church of Jerusalem.

3. The letter from the Council is addressed to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia; see § i. n. 4, for the explanation of the description of the Galatian Churches as "Cilician." That they had in fact been influenced by the judaistic propaganda is clear from Acts xvi. 4. That the teachers had received no formal commission from the Church of Jerusalem is stated in Acts xv. 24, which must be accepted in default of evidence to the contrary. That they should have received any such authorization is however improbable in itself in view of the attitude of S. James and the Pharisees (see below, nn. 35, 36).

4. See Appendix on the Apostolate for the position of these teachers as compared with S. Paul, and see below, c. VII. § iii. n. 10.

5. For the identity of the Churches founded on the "first missionary journey" with the "Galatians" of S. Paul's Epistle see note to this Section. The one serious objection to the view advanced in the text that the Epistle was written at this juncture is the absence of any mention of S. Barnabas in the opening address, where we should expect his name to be mentioned with that of S. Paul. On the other hand it must be remembered that there were numerous Churches in Syria, which owed their origin to Antioch, and for whose supervision the Apostles of Antioch were presumably responsible. It is not unreasonable to suppose that they

may have been temporarily separated by the necessity of meeting the campaign of opposition on the part of the Hebrew Christians and that S. Paul should have written in haste on hearing that their activities threatened to produce a complete defection among the Galatian Churches.

Lightfoot's argument that the similarity between Romans and Galatians proves a close proximity in the date of their composition is really beside the mark. There is no doubt a large measure of agreement, but it is due to the fact that the main theme of both letters, namely, the relation of Christianity to the Law, is the same, and the arguments used are a Pauline adaptation of the common Hellenistic Jewish methods of argument in expounding the O.T. Thus in the list of parallels quoted by Lightfoot (*Galatians*, 45), the whole argument from the faith of Abraham (Gal. iii and Ro. iv) is based on an interpretation of Genesis xv. 6, which is one of Philo's regular "proof-texts." The same applies to the argument from Isaac (Gal. iv. 23, Ro. ix. 7). For the Philonic use of these two O.T. references see c. IV. § i. Appendix. Although S. Paul's arguments are entirely different from those which Philo bases on the same passages, it would seem that he is using texts familiar in the ears of the synagogues of the Dispersion as stock arguments on behalf of Judaism, a fact which deprives their appearance in these two Epistles of any value as evidence of close proximity in point of date. So too the contrast between living in the flesh and living in the spirit (Gal. v. 16, Ro. viii. 4) is a commonplace of Jewish Alexandrine thought and Hellenistic theology in general. Similarly the lists of vices given by S. Paul in Gal. v. 19, Ro. i. 29, xiii. 13, and 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21, are adaptations of the conventional lists of the sins of the heathen which are a regular feature of Hellenistic Jewish literature (c. I. n. 49), the only noticeable feature about them being that in 2 Cor. S. Paul has adapted the list to the failings of the Corinthians by putting sins against the virtues of charity and obedience before the more blatant forms of sin which are generally the favourite theme of Jewish writers. The list of Gal. v. 19 approaches most closely to the Jewish convention (cf. esp. Wisd. xiv. 23, *Or. Sib.* iii. 36). This is only natural, since in Gal. S. Paul is concerned to prove that Christianity is the true means for escaping from the vices of the heathen, whereas in Ro. i. 29 he has to prove that the Jew is in fact no better than the Gentile, and for this purpose he has to draw up a list of sins which will include both the abominations of the heathen and the less lurid, but none the less deadly, sins of the Jew. In Ro. xiii. 13 he is addressing both Jewish and Gentile readers and reverts to a more or less conventional Jewish list.

Further, while the superficial similarities are striking, but not unnatural in view of the general similarity of the theme, the differences are still more remarkable. In both letters S. Paul is dealing with the relations of Christianity to the Law, but while in Gal. he is dealing with a living controversy and fighting desperately against a movement which threatens to ruin the whole of his life's work among the Gentiles, in Ro. he is writing a full *apologia* to Jewish readers, who accept his contention, but none the less feel some difficulty in doing so. The controversy has been decided, and decided in his favour. Hence there is no trace of the violent personal hostility to his opponents which we find in such passages as Gal. i. 8–10, iii. 1–3, iv. 17, v. 10–12, vi. 12, 13. The only trace of it is in Ro. iii. 8, where he is dealing with the last remnants of a defeated opposition. He can even write, as against the unbelieving Jews, in the affectionate language of Ro. ix. 1–6, x. 1, 2, xi. 25 *seqq.* This is because, so far as the Church is concerned, the issue has been settled in favour of the liberty of the Gentiles. At a time when, although the victory had been won, S. Paul did not feel so secure of his position his language as to the unbelieving Jews is that of 1 Thess. ii. 14 *seqq.* S. Paul is capable of violent fluctuations of emotion; but the complete change of temper as between Gal. and Ro. tells more against a close proximity of date than any resemblance of language can tell in favour of it.

It must further be noted that the attempt to place the two letters at about the same date compels us either to reject the whole narrative of Acts xv, or to fall back on a hopelessly artificial attempt to reconcile two narratives, which, if they refer to the same event, are completely contradictory (see c. V. § iii. n. 14). Lightfoot's attempt to identify the two incidents (*Gal.* 126: (the Council was) "the result of much wise forethought and patient deliberation on the part of the Apostles")

reduces the events recorded in Acts xv to a pre-arranged farce on the lines of modern Parliamentary procedure. Further it leaves unexplained and inexplicable the fact that while at Corinth S. Paul's opponents include Jewish Christians of high standing (see below, c. VII. § iii. n. 10) yet we have no trace of any attempt to persuade the Corinthians to observe the Law. This is natural if the Council was, as S. Luke represents it, the end of the controversy as to circumcision, and subsequent to the writing of Gal., but incredible if it was still a living controversy at the time of the Epistle to the Romans.

A further and perhaps final objection to such a date for Gal. is the absence of any allusion to the collection for the Saints. In 1 Cor. S. Paul has made arrangements with the Galatians for this collection (1 Cor. xvi. 1). The importance of it was so great that he could not abstain from mentioning it in his letter to the Romans, although they were not in any way concerned with it. In Galatians there is no allusion to the subject at all. Lightfoot sees such an allusion in vi. 7, ignoring the fact that the reference here is solely to the support owed by Christians to their teachers in the faith, these being local teachers, and clearly not the Christians of Jerusalem. Nor could S. Paul, if he were in fact raising a collection for Jerusalem, have introduced the exceedingly slighting reference to the Christians of Jerusalem and their leaders, and to the earthly Jerusalem itself, without throwing to the winds any hope of success. Had the collection been an immediate matter of concern, it would have been necessary to write with all the diplomacy of the Corinthian Epistles. Even if the Epistle to the Galatians had succeeded in converting its readers from any tendency to judaize, it would have involved a complete collapse of the collection for the Jewish Church.

For a fuller discussion cf. *E.E.P.* 267 *seqq.*, where, however, too much weight is given to the resemblance between this Epistle and Ro.

6. Gal. v. 11, vi. 12, where S. Paul is alluding to persecutions inflicted or likely to be inflicted on Jewish Christians by Jews. There was no great danger of such persecutions in Palestine, so long as the Church was merely a sect of Judaism; but there was every certainty of a violent outbreak of hostility if the Church abandoned the Law completely; in the communities of the Dispersion it is hard to suppose that Christians would have been in any danger at all, if the Church had been content to remain orthodox in its attitude to Judaism. Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 16, where the sufferings of the Church in Palestine are closely associated with the opposition of the orthodox Jews to the attempt to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles.

7. Gal. i. 10.

8. Gal. iv. 10 and cf. c. I. n. 58. For the reference to new moons cf. Hor. *Sat.* I. x. 69 and see *G.J.V.* III. 142. Apparently the years referred to are the years of Jubilee; if so, S. Paul is exaggerating, as such years would hardly be observed outside Palestine.

9. Cf. c. v. § iv *ad fin.* and note the extreme anxiety as to the danger implied in Gal. i. 6. From the point of view of S. Paul's Jewish opponents the statement that the Gospel with the additional burdens of proselytism was a different Gospel from his own could only seem a grossly unjust exaggeration. For S. Paul's attitude cf. c. I. n. 61.

10. The subject of ἔταξαν in Acts xv. 2 must be the community at Antioch. It is highly improbable that S. Paul would have accepted any "orders" in the matter from the Hebrew Christians, as the Western text suggests.

11. Cf. c. v. § i. n. 11 for the attitude of SS. Peter and James.

12. The other Christians who go to Jerusalem in Acts xv. 2 can hardly be mere attendants, since S. Luke would hardly trouble himself with mentioning them. The fact that he refers to them here seems to indicate that the two Apostles were only members of a larger delegation. The reason suggested in the text is of course only conjectural.

13. Gal. i. 1–17. Clearly the passage is an assertion of S. Paul's own authority as regards his Gospel against that of his opponents. It may be noted that the sense of the passage *vv.* 6–7 is easier if εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν is rendered, not "(a different Gospel, which is not another Gospel of the same kind;) only there are some who trouble you and would pervert the Gospel of Christ," but "only they who trouble you and would pervert the Gospel of Christ are somewhat" (*i.e.* are

persons of some importance, τινές being used in the same contemptuous sense of persons regarded as important as τι in ii. 6 and τινα in Acts v. 36.

14. Gal. i. 18–ii. 10. The very slighting allusion to the authority of the older Apostles is only explicable by the fact that the wavering in the case of Titus and on the occasion of the visit of S. Peter to Antioch is still comparatively fresh, and possibly likely to make itself felt again.

15. Gal. ii. 11–14. It is implied that S. Paul's resistance was successful, although the ending of the incident is not recorded (cf. c. v. § iv. n. 6).

16. Gal. ii. 16–21, and cf. c. iv. § i. nn. 25, 31. The argument is complicated by the rhetorical outburst of *v.* 20. S. Paul's point is that the Christian, whether Jew or Gentile, must seek for salvation by faith, not by works of the Law, which cannot make him righteous, as experience shows. If, however, after the Christian has believed, he still needs the Law to make him righteous, it follows that the Christian dispensation leaves the believer in a state of sin, from which the Law must deliver him. In other words Christ Himself brings men into sin; for He proclaimed the abolition of the Law, and only a sinner could first proclaim a new dispensation to abolish the Law, and then admit that after all the Law was still needed. The Law is the means which enabled man to see that something was needed better than itself; this knowledge enables the Christian to die to the Law in order to live to God. If, on the other hand, the Law is still needed, the free gift of God, manifested in the death of Christ, is worthless. The Law is the only means left for attaining to righteousness, and since it existed before the death of Christ, His death has done nothing.

17. Gal. iii. 1–6. "The Spirit" here of course refers to outward manifestations.

18. Gal. iii. 7–9. For the argument from the faith of Abraham cf. c. iv. § i. Appendix I.

19. Gal. iii. 10–22. The compression of the argument makes this passage extremely obscure. S. Paul assumes that the blessing promised to Abraham is righteousness, *i.e.* the power to attain to righteousness, with, of course, the reward of eternal salvation attached to it. His opponents might argue that the fulfilment of the promise could be realized by the promulgation of the Law to the Gentiles (cf. c. i. n. 57 for the conception of the Messianic kingdom as being accompanied by the acceptance of the Law by the Gentiles). S. Paul replies that this argument cannot be maintained for the following reasons.

(*a*) God promised a blessing, but the Law utters a curse on all who disobey it. Since no one can in fact obey the Law, the Law brings on all men a curse and not a blessing. (For this idea in 4 Esdr. cf. c. iv. § i. n. 9.)

(*b*) According to Hab. ii. 4 righteousness will one day be made possible as the reward of faith; but according to Lev. xviii. 5 the life of the Law is a life of works, *i.e.* of external obedience.

Christ by bearing the curse attached to the death of the Cross has abolished the curse attached to disobedience to the Law and rendered possible the inauguration of the new reign of faith (c. iv. § i. n. 22).

(*c*) The promise of God must be exactly fulfilled. If the Law is not the fulfilment of the promise, it cannot annul the earlier promise, for such a belief would imply that it is possible to annul the promise of God. It has already been shown that the Law is not the promise: therefore the promise remained. That it has in fact been fulfilled in Christ is confirmed by the further argument that the promise was made not to many, but to one (namely, to Christ), whereas the Law was given to many people, namely, the whole nation. Nor was it given by God directly, for it was given through angels, and it was therefore necessary for Moses to act as a mediator; whereas had God given the Law Himself He could have done so without a mediator. It follows:

(i) that the promised inheritance cannot come through the Law, unless we are prepared to believe that the promises of God can be annulled;

(ii) that the Law was only an interim measure until the time for the fulfilment of the promise had come.

20. Gal. iii. 23–iv. 7.

21. Gal. iv. 8–20.

22. Gal. iv. 21–31. For Hagar in Philo cf. c. iv. § i. Appendix I; for the contrast

between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem in contemporary Jewish apocalyptic, *ib.* n. 9; for Jerusalem and Sinai, *ib.* n. 14.

23. Gal. v. 1–12. There are really three lines of thought here:

(*a*) Circumcision implies a repudiation of Christ, and therefore the Gentile who accepts it after baptism has forfeited his claim to salvation in Christ.

(*b*) Circumcision by itself will not even secure you such advantages as the Law can give, unless you add to it the observance of the whole Law in the Pharisaical interpretation.

(*c*) The advocates of circumcision are really only anxious to escape that persecution which is the stumbling-block of the Cross, and the mark of the true Christian.

24. Gal. v. 13–26 and cf. c. IV. § i. n. 31. Logically this is the weak point in the Epistle, since it assumes that a person who has once been converted will in fact feel no desire to yield to the temptations of the flesh, because he will be in the Spirit. S. Paul's opponents could reply with some truth that this need not be the case by any means. S. Paul cannot use any argument which would imply the existence of any moral law for Christians without leaving his opponents the obvious retort that the Jewish Law is the moral law in question, or at least a necessary guarantee for the observance of such a law.

25. Gal. vi. 1–10.

26. Gal. vi. 11–end. The motives are of course the desire to avoid persecution and to secure the pre-eminence of the Jewish nation over the rest of the world. For the latter cf. Gal. iv. 17, where the judaizers are zealous for the exclusion of the Gentiles in order that the Gentiles may be zealous to be like them. Cf. also c. IV. § i. n. 56. For the use of ζῆλος as a quality which may be good or evil according to circumstances cf. the Pseudo-Phocylides incorporated in *Or. Sib.* ii. 137: ζῆλος τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐσθλός, φαύλων δέ τε φαῦλος.

27. The haste with which S. Paul wrote this letter reveals itself in the obscurity of the story of Titus, and the failure to give the ending of the controversy with S. Peter at Antioch. Again the sequence of thought is interrupted at iv. 12 by an appeal to the Galatians, which lasts till *v.* 20. At v. 2 there is a similar break, lasting till *v.* 12 The hurried tone of the letter is recognized by most commentators, cf. Lightfoot, p. 49.

28. S. Paul never allows in this Epistle for the fact that those not brought up in a strict system of morality may be genuinely converted to the Christian religion without having their whole nature so changed as to find that there is no difficulty in overcoming the more obvious forms of temptation. In 1 Cor. iii. 2 he recognizes the fact, but does not recognize that it is the natural thing to expect.

29. For this sense of the powerlessness of the Law to produce righteousness cf. the references to 4 Esdr. in c. IV. § i. n. 9, and for the tendency to serious moral laxity and even complete apostasy among the Jews of the Dispersion see c. I. n. 50.

30. The reference to Samaria and Phoenicia in Acts xv. 3 and the omission of any reference to Judaea, which the Apostles were bound to pass through, can only be intentional. Obviously they would not narrate the story of the conversion of the Gentiles to the Jews in Judaea, or, if they did, would not be received with enthusiasm. The incidental notice of the enthusiasm of Phoenicia and Samaria is therefore of some importance as evidence of the relations of these communities to those of Judaea. Cf. c. III. § i. n. 12.

31. It would be of interest to know whether these communities were regarded as falling under the supervision of any particular members of the Twelve or other leading Christians, such as S. Philip, who were likely to be present at Jerusalem, or whether they were in any way represented, as for instance by the inclusion of their presbyters at the Council. It would seem, however, that only the presbyters of the Mother-Church were present, in virtue of the rather vague claim of Jerusalem to a general authority over the whole Christian world (c. V. § ii. n. 35).

32. The words απὸ της ἐκκλησίας present a certain difficulty as implying some person or body which is distinct from the Twelve and the presbyters. On the analogy of Acts xxi. 18 it is hardly possible to see in "the Church" here any person or organization but S. James. In this case the word is used as equivalent to "the representative of the Church." We have a clear parallel to this use in 1 Cor. xvi. 19, where the "Churches of Asia" are in fact the representatives of those Churches

assembled for the purpose of the collection for the Saints. Another instance of such an usage occurs in Gal. i. 22, where the "Churches of Judaea" are apparently to be identified with the members of the Twelve who are responsible for their supervision (see above, c. III. § ii. n. 20). Another instance seems to be found in 2 Cor. viii. 19, where the Churches which appoint S. Paul's unnamed companion are clearly representatives of some group of Churches and not actual meetings of whole Christian communities (see below, c. VII. § i. n. 27). In these cases, however, the usage is rendered easier by the fact that the word is used in a general sense of persons who are to be identified with the communities they represent, whereas in the present passage the use of the singular to describe a person who is the official representative of the Church of Jerusalem as a whole, and as such distinct from the Apostles and presbyters, is very forced. On the other hand it is very difficult to find any other meaning for the word, especially in view of Acts xxi. 18. The interpretation, however, if correct, is of considerable importance, since it implies that S. Luke regards it as possible to speak of "the Church" when he wishes to describe a single person who is its corporate representative.

Naturally this meaning cannot be pressed to prove that S. Luke regarded it as inevitable that there should be in any Church or group of Churches one such representative,[1] or that he was familiar with the institution of a "monarchical episcopate." Normally, indeed, there would be not one but two Apostles to act in this capacity, if the Twelve were recognized as having any special local spheres of activity. It does, however, imply that he and his readers are already familiar with the idea that a single person can be the official spokesman and representative of a Christian body. A very noticeable parallel to this usage of the word occurs in S. Ignatius, *Ad Trall.* xii, *ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ Σμύρνης ἅμα ταῖς συμπαρούσαις μοι ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἳ κατὰ πάντα με ἀνέπαυσαν σαρκί τε καὶ πνεύματι.*

33. § i. n. 4.

34. c. I. n. 41 and c. III. § ii. nn. 35 *seqq.*

35. The whole passage, Acts xv. 1–5, is misunderstood, if the demand of *v.* 5 is regarded as the same as that of *v.* 1. It is in any case incredible that S. Luke should have written so clumsily as we are forced to suppose that he has done, if the usual interpretation be followed. On this interpretation we have first a quarrel over circumcision at Antioch, which leads to the journey at Jerusalem to settle the matter: at Jerusalem the Pharisees raise the demand for circumcision as if it had never been mentioned before. Then in *v.* 6 we are told that a meeting is arranged to consider the question, when the original reason for the meeting in *v.* 4 was to discuss this very matter. In fact *vv.* 4 and 5 might be omitted without any loss to the sense of the passage. Moreover it is impossible to explain why the Pharisees should be introduced and made to voice a demand which is differently worded from that of *v.* 1 unless they are meant to be asking for something different. The Bezan editor saw this difficulty, and has endeavoured to meet it by assimilating the wording of *vv.* 1 and 5, without, however, avoiding the difficulty of the double mention of the same demand. Nor does the conventional interpretation explain the double statement by S. Paul and S. Barnabas as to their work among the Gentiles.

There are, however, further insuperable objections to that explanation. In view of Acts x. 14 it is unthinkable (see n. 37) that S. Peter should be represented as describing the Law, as understood by the ordinary Jew, as an intolerable yoke. The whole Christian movement had originated in circles which had always been zealous for the Law, and continued to be so still (Acts xxi. 20). But in spite of the veneration felt by popular Judaism for the zeal of the Pharisees, the ordinary Jews refused to follow them in practice, and Our Lord's ministry was a definite reaction against the whole system of the Pharisees and owed to the fact a large element of its popularity (c. I. n. 46). But the Pharisees regarded this standard of Judaism as worthless (c. I. n. 47), and expected their proselytes to accept the whole Pharisaical system, a view which S. Paul puts forward as the logical alternative to the complete freedom of the Gentiles (Mt. xxiii. 15, and cf. c. III. § ii. n. 36 and c. V. § iv. n. 5). Although in practice the proselytes, especially those of the Dispersion, were not asked to observe the Law as strictly as the born Jew, there was no foundation for this distinction in the Law, and it was not recognized by the Pharisees.

It seems therefore that the only interpretation which is consistent with the

language of xv. 1–5 and with the facts of the situation is to regard the demand of the Pharisee converts as a demand for something different from that of the emissaries of *v.* 1. The latter are ordinary Jewish Christians, demanding of the Gentiles the measure of legal observance common among the proselytes of the Dispersion; the Pharisees, on the other hand, demand a general recognition of Pharisaism as the proper method of observing the Law. How far the demand was seriously made is open to doubt, but the extremist, who refuses to see any value in any form of orthodoxy which falls short of his own standard, is a common phenomenon of religious history. There is nothing psychologically improbable in the emergence of such a demand, even though it had not the remotest prospect of general acceptance. It is, of course, possible that the Pharisees were influential enough to have some hope of persuading the Hebrew Christians to accept their view, but this can hardly be regarded as likely.

36. Acts xv. 6. This is the natural explanation of the fact that the meeting of the Council is recorded apparently as a separate event from the meeting of *v.* 4. The mere fact that there were two meetings at Jerusalem to discuss the matter would not have been worth recording; the point of mentioning them is to show that the new demand of the Pharisees involved an adjournment of the first meeting, which would naturally have discussed whether Gentile converts should be circumcised. The entirely fresh point of view advanced by the Pharisees involved a reopening of the whole question. It is, however, possible that we are merely faced with a very clumsy piece of writing.

37. It would seem that S. Peter here insists on the fact that the acceptance of the conversion of Cornelius, hitherto regarded as an exceptional case (see above, c. IV. § ii. n. 12), really proves that conversion to Christianity must in all cases be accepted as sufficient to convey that moral holiness, which the system of Pharisaism endeavoured to inculcate by its rigid insistence on ceremonial purity. (For the emphasis laid on this by the Pharisees, especially as regards the intercourse of Jews and Gentiles, cf. *G.J.V.* II. 91; the use of *καθαρίσας* is therefore entirely correct.) The theology of S. Peter's speech is of course entirely Pauline; this, however, is no proof that it is not a genuine summary remembered by S. Paul or some other eyewitness, since S. Peter would naturally borrow his arguments from one who was so much his superior in Jewish theology.

The language of Acts xv. 10 applies of course only to the demand of the Pharisees. S. Peter would certainly not have described the ordinary standard of legal observance as an intolerable yoke. Cf. Acts x. 14 and c. I. n. 46. Moreover, such an attack on the whole Jewish system would have been a direct challenge to the Hebrew Christians, which would certainly have excited an infuriated opposition. In view of his attitude in the case of Cornelius it is incredible that S. Peter should have shown either so much courage or so little discretion as to have launched a general attack on the Jewish system in front of an audience mainly consisting of Hebrew Christians.

38. S. Peter's argument to justify his action in dealing with Cornelius in Acts xi. 15 *seqq.* depended entirely on the fact that it was forced on him by the manifestation of divine approval. The emphasis in Acts xv. 12 is on *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα* (note the latter word, which is a very strong one, as in Acts ii. 19), the speeches of S. Paul and S. Barnabas being not a clumsy repetition of their report to the meeting at Jerusalem on their work among the Gentiles (already recorded in *v.* 4), but a claim that their work has been accompanied by miraculous phenomena parallel to those on the strength of which S. Peter justified his action in the case of Cornelius.

39. The suggestion that S. James is to be regarded as the president of the assembly, and that his speech is an authoritative verdict closing the discussion, is entirely beside the mark. The debate follows the lines of procedure in the Sanhedrin, as in Acts v. 28 *seqq.* The fact that S. Peter intervenes at an early stage to advocate a definite course of action is in no way contrary to Jewish views as to the function of the president, as appears from the action of the High Priest in that passage and Acts xxiii. 2. S. James' speech is mentioned last as being the proposal that is finally adopted, as is the case with Gamaliel. For this use of *κρίνω* cf. *Vocab. of Gr. Test. s.v.*

40. Apparently the argument here is that the Christian revelation so far as the

Jews are concerned is the restoration of the tabernacle of David. This implies that the old dispensation was defective, since otherwise there would have been no breaches to restore. The restoration was to be accompanied by the conversion of the Gentiles; and now that this prophecy has been fulfilled, it is idle to impose on them the old and admittedly defective system, when they already possess in Christianity the power which even the Jewish religion needed to make it perfect.

There is a certain difficulty in Acts xv. 21, since it seems strange that S. James should make the rather contemptuous statement that Moses had been read in the synagogues for so long without converting the Gentiles, that the whole Law could be dismissed as worthless. It is possible that the meaning is that while Moses has failed for so long to convert the Gentiles, in spite of the fact that his works are read in the synagogue every sabbath, yet he has succeeded in converting some. Therefore those who desire to learn and follow his system in addition to Christianity can do so by attending the synagogue as they have done in the past, while those who do not wish to follow Judaism as well as Christianity can be content with the essentials which are common both to the Jewish and the Christian systems.

It is possible that he hoped that many Gentile converts would in fact also become proselytes of Judaism. The summary of the speech is, however, so brief that it is hardly possible to be clear as to the exact meaning of this verse. Its obvious meaning, *i.e.* that Moses has failed to convert the Gentiles, although he has been preached to them for generations in the synagogues, seems strange in the mouth of a Pharisee. The probable explanation of the whole speech is that in fact S. Luke's informant remembers the O.T. texts which S. James quoted, and the general purport of his proposals, and nothing more. Psychologically this is probable enough, since the quotations in a speech tend to impress themselves on the memory far more than the general arguments. In this case it is quite possible that the last verse is a free composition by the author of the Acts or by his informant.

41. The account given in the text assumes the correctness of the received version of Acts xv. 29, which runs *ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ πνικτῶν καὶ πορνείας· ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε* with a corresponding text in *v.* 20. This represents the general reading of most MSS.; but the Codex Bezae and a number of ancient Western authorities going back as far as S. Irenaeus present a completely different aspect of the decision of the Council and read *ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ πορνείας καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἑτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν· ἀφ' ὧν διατηροῦντες εὖ πράξετε φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι* omitting *καὶ πνικτοῦ* in *v.* 20.

There are minor variations in this group, as in the texts which follow the received version; an account of these will be found in *E.E.P.* pp. 48 *seqq.* Although the MS. authority is overwhelmingly in favour of the received text, it must be noted that the other has the support of Irenaeus and Cyprian, while Tertullian has a shorter text omitting *καὶ πνικτῶν* and *καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἑτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν*, which Lake regards as the true text apart from the clause *φερόμενοι...πνεύματι.*

Of these readings the generally received text is open to suspicion, on the grounds that S. Paul nowhere alludes to such a decree, while had there been in fact a Christian food-law he could hardly have avoided mentioning it in 1 Cor. x and Ro. xiv. The second reading cannot stand as we find it, the latter part being obviously an explanation added later in the manner characteristic of the Codex Bezae. The question therefore is whether the words *καὶ πνικτῶν* are original or an explanation of the existence of a Christian food-law found in certain parts of the Church at a later period, *i.e.* whether the original decree of the Council contained an enactment that the Gentile converts were to abstain from things offered to idols, from certain kinds of meat, and from fornication, or simply a brief summary of the Christian moral law, commanding Gentile converts to abstain from idolatry, murder (the use of *αἷμα* as meaning bloodshed is well attested, *e.g.* Wisd. xiv. 25), and fornication.

As against the received text we have besides the silence of S. Paul the fact that there was no universal observance of such a food-law in the early Church, while there were laws of this kind in Gaul and in Africa, where, however, the evidence of Irenaeus and Tertullian shows that the decrees of the Council were read as a general moral law, not as the basis of the local food-law. For further evidence see Lake, *loc. cit.* In favour of the received text must be reckoned the fact that it is easier

to explain the corruption of the text if the original decree did in fact contain a regulation as to food which was never widely observed. A copyist would naturally find it easy to change such a regulation into a moral law. The question therefore arises whether it is possible to explain the silence of S. Paul and the failure of the primitive Church to observe the regulations of the Council. If so, the received text must be preferred, as it is easier to explain its alteration by a scribe who was endeavouring to find a text which would not conflict with the practice of the Church as he knew it, than to suppose that a local food-regulation of Alexandria was incorporated into the original text of the Acts and finally prevailed as the received text.

S. Paul's silence is indeed remarkable, but not incapable of explanation. When the actual decrees were framed it was expected that the Christian communities would consist largely of Jews, and a food-law would be necessary to protect them at the common meals of the Church from contact with food which would involve them in ceremonial uncleanness. At Corinth the evidence seems to show that there was a large majority of Gentile converts, and S. Paul may not have felt himself bound to consider the Jewish minority to the extent of insisting on the food-laws, except in so far as concerned the eating of εἰδωλόθυτα in circumstances which would directly condone the practice of idolatry. In any case he had particular reasons for settling the difficulty at Corinth by arguing from first principles, rather than by appealing to the authority of the Council (see c. VII. § iii. n. 31). In Romans S. Paul is writing to Gentile Christians in the passage under consideration, and he may have felt himself free to ignore the decision so far as the private life of Gentile converts was concerned. The weaker brethren of Ro. xiv. 1 *seqq.* are certainly not Jews, but apparently ex-proselytes, who are scrupulous as to their relation to the Law. Thus it seems likely that S. Paul did not feel himself bound to enforce those decrees, except in so far as meals where Jews and Gentiles met were involved, outside the Churches to which the letter was originally addressed. It is argued that in this case S. Luke would not have been so careful to preserve the text of the decrees. This is not conclusive, since although in part obsolete when he wrote, they were none the less the first charter of Gentile liberty.

It is to be observed that if this explanation be admitted, the decrees simply deal with religion, and not with morality as such, the latter subject being omitted as too obvious to need statement. Thus the first three prohibitions cover forms of food which imply the condonation of idolatry or render the common social life of Jews and Gentiles impossible, while the last prohibition aims at immorality practised under the cloak of religion. This interpretation has one very strong point in its favour. We have a large number of Jewish descriptions of the vices of the Gentiles, and it is plain from them that the Jews held in particular abomination the unnatural forms of vice prevalent among the heathen (cf. c. I. n. 49). It is very remarkable that a Jewish-Christian Council should address a general summary of the Christian law to the Gentiles, which made no allusion to such practices, except under the general term of πορνεία. On the other hand, if the decrees simply concerned themselves with the difference between Christianity and idolatry, there would be no need to mention these forms of vice, which had no direct sanction as religious observances among the Gentiles, as fornication had.

This explanation appears to cover the fact that the generally received text appears to contain a food-law, which was only current in the Church for a few years and never extended beyond the Gentile communities of Palestine, Syria, Cilicia and Galatia, and it is easy to understand the process by which the text became altered, when it no longer corresponded to the facts of Christian practice. None the less it cannot be accepted as certain, and it must be recognized as just possible that the original decree prohibited the eating of idol-meats (in this case S. Paul must have considered himself at liberty to limit that prohibition to the eating of such meats in circumstances implying the approval of idolatry), murder, and fornication, the three forms of vice which a Jew would regard as characteristic of the Gentiles (though it remains difficult to explain the use of πορνεία to cover all forms of sexual immorality).

If the decrees are to be interpreted in this sense, the compromise put forward by S. James was to the effect that the Gentiles should be solemnly warned as to the identity of Jewish and Christian morality, and nothing more. Theologically

either compromise would be equally distasteful to S. Paul, as involving the introduction of the idea of a moral law; in either case he would have the satisfaction of a victory in the essential matter. The view that we have simply a moral law is tempting, but textually it is very difficult to justify the abandonment of the received version.

42. It seems probable that Silas was a Hellenist in view of 1 Thess. i. 1, where his name appears in the Gentile form of Silvanus. If so he would appear to be like John Mark a Hellenist, who had not at the time of the persecution been known to hold the teaching of S. Stephen in an extreme form, or who had been converted since. It is hardly likely that a Hellenist who had been an active supporter of S. Stephen would be able to remain in Jerusalem.

Judas is apparently a brother of the Joseph of Acts i. 23, and probably was himself one of Our Lord's disciples. In this case he would appear to be one of the party of circumcision in the proper sense.

NOTE ON THE MEANING OF GALATIA

For a full statement of the grounds on which modern critics are tending to identify the "Galatians," to whom S. Paul writes, with the Christians of the Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe the reader is referred to Ramsay's works dealing with the subject. A summary of the arguments may be found in *E.E.P.* pp. 253 *seqq*. The outstanding reasons for this identification, which is adopted in the text, are given here.

In the first place it is to be observed that we have no evidence at all that S. Paul ever preached in the district which was ethnographically Galatian, *i.e.* the country in the neighbourhood of Pessinus, Ancyra and Tavium. We are informed that he went through a region described as Galatic in Acts xvi. 6 and again a Galatic region meets us in Acts xviii. 23. Here again we are told that S. Paul went through it; but the word διέρχομαι, as has been shown above, cannot be pressed to imply that the journey was a missionary journey. The idea that it bears this connotation depends entirely on Acts xvi. 6 and the quite unfounded assumption that S. Paul preached on his journey through Cyprus in Acts xiii. 6.

In any case it is antecedently unlikely that S. Paul should have visited the northern regions of Galatia. On his first journey he is apparently contemplating the formation of a "diocese" extending from Tarsus and Cilicia to Ephesus through the Pisidian Antioch (see § i. n. 13). It is quite clear that he intended to do so on his second journey; he was only prevented from doing so by the fact that the Holy Ghost hindered him from preaching in Asia. He then proceeds through a region described as "Phrygian and Galatian" to a point "over against" Mysia, meaning to enter Bithynia, but is prevented by the Spirit of Jesus. A glance at the map will show how unnatural it is that he should from Antioch in Pisidia travel in a north-easterly direction to some point such as Ancyra, then turn due west to a point "over against" Mysia, and then try to enter Bithynia. Further Galatia was not the sort of region that would naturally

attract S. Paul; it lay well away from the main lines of communication between Syria and the West, and apart from the capital Ancyra had no towns of any great importance. The Celtic organization by cantons rather than by cities still survived, and the Celtic language lingered long afterwards (*P.R.E.* I. 341). The historical probability lies on the side of the view that the journey described in Acts xvi. 6 is a journey direct from the Pisidian Antioch to Dorylaeum, intended to bring S. Paul to the cities of the Bithynian coast, such as Nicaea and Nicomedia, and Byzantium, which at this period belonged to the province (*P.R.E.* I. 305).

To turn to the actual journeys of Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 22, 23, it is certain that in the former case the words διῆλθον τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν cannot mean "went through Phrygia and Galatia." For this meaning we should need τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν or Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατίαν. The MS. variation διῆλθον and διελθόντες need not be examined here; in any case we have one region described by two names, not two regions. Ramsay holds that the phrase means "the Phrygo-Galatic region," and refers to the region which lay round the Pisidian Antioch, this territory being a piece of Phrygia, which had been added to the province of Galatia. This seems doubtful; there is no evidence of such a title being used for this region, and it is not a very satisfactory description of a journey from Iconium, the last city mentioned, through the Pisidian Antioch to a point, presumably Dorylaeum, on the frontier of Bithynia, to say that S. Paul went through a "Phrygo-Galatic" region, which certainly only extended a few miles north of Antioch. It seems simpler to interpret the phrase as meaning the whole region which lies between Iconium and Dorylaeum, through which S. Paul had to pass. This lay partly in Galatia, and partly in Phrygia. On the other hand such a journey could not be described as a journey through Galatia and Phrygia, which to Levantine readers, such as those for whom S. Luke wrote, would naturally imply that S. Paul made a journey through the region known as Phrygia and the province of Galatia, not along the borders of the two districts. Such a journey would, as Harnack admits, be spent very largely in an ill-populated region, and it has been shown that it is *a priori* most improbable. The case for it is very much weakened by the fact that S. Luke writes of the Phrygian and Galatian country, not Phrygia and Galatia. This "country" however is not a small "Phrygo-Galatic region," as Ramsay suggests, but the whole country through which S. Paul's route passed. The only full phrase that would describe it is "the regions on the borders of Phrygia and Galatia," parts of it being in Galatia but on the borders of Phrygia, and the rest in Phrygia, but on the borders of Galatia. (It will of course be observed that the route traversed is the same as that suggested by Ramsay, the journey described by the words being one which turns north from some point in

the neighbourhood of the Pisidian Antioch and brings S. Paul to Dorylaeum.)

In Acts xviii. 22, 23, it has been commonly assumed that we have a reference to the same region. For this assumption, however, there is no evidence. S. Paul on this occasion is travelling not from the Pisidian Antioch to some point from which he can enter Bithynia but from the Syrian Antioch to Ephesus. As far as the Pisidian Antioch the route is certainly the same as that of Acts xvi. 6. From this point however S. Paul continues his journey in a totally different direction from the former occasion. Instead of turning to the north he goes straight on in a westerly direction and arrives at Ephesus. The words of the text bear their obvious meaning of "through the Galatian country and Phrygia." *Φρυγίαν* here as an adjective is difficult if not impossible and gives no explanation of the change in the order of the words as between Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 22, 23.

If, on the other hand, the rendering "the Galatic country and Phrygia" be accepted, the reason for the change is obvious. The journey first passes through the Galatian country, *i.e.* the part of Galatia in which S. Paul had founded four Churches, and then through Phrygia, the phrase being the natural one for describing a journey through Iconium, the Pisidian Antioch and Phrygia to the Asiatic coast at Ephesus. There is one verbal inaccuracy about it, since the words "confirming the disciples" refer only to that part of the journey which lay in the Galatian country, there being as yet, so far as we know, no converts in Phrygia proper, but obviously such an inaccuracy is one of which the most careful writer might be guilty. The change of language as between Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23 is due to the fact that S. Luke is describing two quite different routes. Had he written "the Galatian country and Phrygia" in the former passage, his readers would naturally assume that he meant a journey through Phrygia down to the coast of Asia.

There is therefore no evidence for any missionary journey undertaken by S. Paul in Galatia proper, nor indeed is there any evidence that he preached the Gospel anywhere in Asia Minor apart from the cities evangelized on his first journey until his arrival at Ephesus. It has already been pointed out that the Galatian Epistle cannot be dated at any period in S. Paul's career except the interval between the end of his first journey and the Council of Jerusalem (c. v. § iii. n. 14 and n. 5 to this Section, and for the reasons for which these Churches are grouped with those of Syria and Cilicia in the letter of the Council see § i. n. 4). Although, however, S. Paul at Jerusalem might vaguely describe these Churches as "Cilician" in order to avoid raising questions as to his right to preach the Gospel in new regions without any consent from the Twelve or from the Church of Jerusalem, he certainly could not address them in a letter as "Cilicians."

Nor is it easier to see any general name by which he could have addressed the Christians of all these cities except that of Galatians. He could hardly write to the Church of Antioch as representing the whole group in the same way as he writes to Corinth as representing the Churches of Achaea (2 Cor. i. 1). Antioch was the most important city of the four, but it owed its importance to the fact that it was a colony and larger than its sister-colony of Lystra. Iconium was of greater antiquity and commercial importance, and probably would not care to be regarded as a kind of appanage of Antioch. There was no common nationality which could cover all four communities. They included possibly some descendants of the Roman colonists of Antioch and Lystra, who appear from Acts xiii. 50 to have been in close relations with the Jews at the former city and may have provided some converts at a very early period, Greeks and Macedonians descended from the Seleucid settlement, hellenized Phrygians and Lycaonians, and Jews. No single name except that of the province would cover all the converts. Cf. further Ramsay in *J.R.S.* XII. 147 *seqq.*

The possible reference to two visits in Gal. iv. 13 (τὸ πρότερον) is of course no evidence against the view that the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to these Churches, since S. Paul had in fact paid two separate visits to each of them (with the exception of Derbe) before the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xiv. 21; if his journey inland was partly due to ill-health he would have ample time to recover while wintering at Derbe).

For these reasons and those advanced more fully in the works referred to above it seems safe to identify the Churches of this journey with the Churches addressed in the Epistle to the Galatians. The argument that the contents of the letter imply a date approximating to that of Romans is dealt with above in n. 5 to this Section.

§ iii. THE SECOND JOURNEY

The news of the victory was received at Antioch with enthusiasm. The delegates from Jerusalem demonstrated their loyalty to the decision by going beyond the limits of their task and using their powers as prophets for the edification of the converts of Antioch before returning. Owing to the season of the year at which the decision of the Council was reached, it was impossible to convey it immediately to the Galatian Churches, and accordingly Paul and Barnabas remained at Antioch until the opening of the spring of A.D. 50. It was however necessary that, as soon as the conditions permitted, they should revisit the scene of their former labours. The extended area of Christendom rendered it impossible to exercise

continual personal supervision over the whole region for which they were responsible, but this could be replaced by using the seasons when travelling was possible for the purpose of securing the converts against the dangers to which they might be exposed. In the present instance the visit was particularly needed in order to counteract the evils produced by the activities of the judaizing teachers; in spite of Paul's letter it was manifestly necessary to give them definite evidence that his view was that of the whole Christian society.

As soon however as the arrangements for the journey came under discussion a difficulty arose. Barnabas insisted that Mark should accompany them, while Paul refused to take as his subordinate one whom he regarded as having deserted the cause during the last journey. The result was a quarrel, which ended in Barnabas taking Mark, and sailing for Cyprus, leaving Paul to look after the needs of his converts in Galatia[1]. The division corresponded to the actual facts, since Barnabas had taken the lead in Cyprus and Paul in the remainder of the journey. It had the further advantage of relieving Paul from the necessity of allowing in his plans for a visitation of Cyprus. This necessity would not be felt as long as the area evangelized ended with the Pisidian Antioch; but in the event of any further extension of the Church in the direction of Ephesus a visitation of all the new Churches would involve him in a very circuitous journey. On the other hand such an extension of the Church was the only logical result of his advance to the Pisidian Antioch. The cities evangelized were too small to content their founder except as stepping-stones to something greater.

At the same time it was necessary for Paul to provide himself with a companion. The general rule, based on the precedent established by Jesus Himself, that the work of the Apostles should be carried out by two and two could hardly be ignored without the risk of criticism which it was desirable to avoid[2]. Consequently it was necessary to replace Barnabas, and for the purpose he chose Silas, one of the delegates from the Council of Jerusalem to the Church of Antioch. Apart from his personal qualities, he was recommended by the fact that he was a Christian of Jerusalem, and in choosing him Paul paid a compliment to that community, which might assist to allay the irritation which the decision of the Council was certain to evoke. He was also a Roman citizen and thus shared Paul's immunity from the severer forms of legal persecution which local magistrates had the right to inflict. This was a matter of some importance, since Paul could scarcely claim privileges which were not shared by his colleague[3].

On the other hand the choice was not without its drawbacks. The question of Paul's exact position in the Church had not been raised at the Council. He had been recognized by the three chief Apostles on the occasion of the famine-visit as enjoying an authority as regards the Gentiles equal to that of Peter in respect of the Jews. But that agreement rested only on the authority of the leaders themselves, and subsequent events had shown that their followers were quite capable of repudiating such decisions; indeed they could claim that the Council was a complete vindication of their right to be consulted in all questions of importance to the whole community. Paul's position as an Apostle had never been recognized by the Council, for it had never been discussed. He did indeed regard his position as due to direct divine appointment, but this was obviously open to dispute. He had no doubt seen the Lord, but so had many others who were not Apostles, at any rate in the same sense as the Twelve. His only further claim rested on his commission from the Church of Jerusalem to preach at Tarsus on the occasion of his departure from the city in face of the plots of the Hellenist Jews. Thus it was possible for many of the leading members of the Church to urge that he had not the same authority as the Twelve, and to claim for themselves a position equal to his[4]. Similarly, the position of Silas at Jerusalem was inferior to that of the Twelve. Even if he had seen the Lord in the flesh and received from Him some commission to preach the Gospel, he had no strict claims to be more than the equal of many other Christians who held the same position at Jerusalem, except in so far as he had been commissioned to bear the decrees of the Council from Jerusalem to Antioch or had received some subsequent commission for the new journey. This new journey, however, might easily be regarded as simply an extension of his original commission of conveying the decisions of the Council to the Church of Antioch, since its first objective was to allay the controversy aroused by the activities of the Jewish teachers in the Churches of Galatia. Whatever authority the new venture received from Jerusalem or Antioch, it could in any case be represented with a considerable degree of plausibility as a mere continuation of the mission of Silas from the former city to the latter[5].

As yet, however, this danger was not contemplated, and the Apostles opened their labours with visits to the communities of Syria and Cilicia, proceeding thence to the younger Churches of Derbe and Lystra. Here they handed to the converts the decision of the Council of Jerusalem. At Lystra the party was enlarged by the inclusion of

Timothy, a convert of the former journey, son of a Gentile father and a Jewish mother, to supply the place occupied on the first journey by Mark. In his case, in view of his half-Jewish origin, Paul judged it right to conciliate Jewish opinion by circumcising him, and so avoiding any possible charge of abolishing the obligation of the Law so far as Jews were concerned[6].

From the Pisidian Antioch the next step was naturally to continue the journey in the direction of the province of Asia. The result of such an extension of the area of Paul's labours would be to produce a province stretching from the Syrian Antioch to Ephesus along the line of the main road. The whole of the intervening territories would of course not be evangelized, but communities could be established in the chief cities along the route. From these the faith could gradually permeate the surrounding rural areas. Thus it was possible for Paul to hope to establish a chain of Churches which could be easily worked as a single "diocese" in the same way as the Apostles of Palestine supervised the Churches under their charge[7]. The size of the district would of course exceed enormously the size of the more primitive groups of Churches, but from the point of view of travel it was scarcely harder to conduct a visitation of the larger cities lying along a single road than to move up and down the whole of a scattered countryside, especially one in such a disturbed condition as Judaea. Nor was it to be expected that the new Churches would increase too rapidly for personal supervision for some time to come. The scheme was ambitious but by no means impracticable. It would clearly be unwise to attempt more in view of the problems which the new converts were likely to offer to their first evangelists. The route had the additional advantage of permitting an easy return from a visitation of the inland Churches to the Syrian Antioch by sea, if circumstances necessitated a rapid return to Palestine. Ephesus itself was the capital of the Roman province of Asia, and its size and importance rendered it unlikely that the Apostles would have much to fear from mob-violence or the illegalities of local magistrates which had so much hampered the work of the previous journey. There was always an easy appeal to the proconsular government, which was not likely to intervene in a purely Jewish quarrel. Finally the situation and commercial importance of the city offered hopes that the Gospel would without any direct effort on their part spread itself through Asia and across the Aegean, and thus prepare the way for some future time when either they or their successors would find further openings for progress into other regions of the Gentile world. On

the Jewish side it was the centre of the Dispersion in Asia. It offered prospects for the dissemination of the true version of the national faith throughout the Jews of the province, and also it provided a privileged centre for the future development of the most important part of Paul's schemes for securing the unity of the Gentiles with the Mother-Church[8].

But the Apostles had scarcely concluded their visits to Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch, when a check occurred. The Holy Ghost would not allow them to proceed to Ephesus. They turned northwards hoping to find themselves permitted to enter some other city in the province; but the same obstacle barred the way[9]. They proceeded along the borders of Phrygia and the province of Galatia, and finding progress westwards impossible resolved on a visit to Bithynia. This scheme involved a serious drawback as compared with the former, since it left a wide gap of thinly populated country between the Pisidian Antioch and the nearest city in which it was possible to preach the Gospel with any hope of considerable success. None the less the cities of Bithynia were growing rapidly in size and importance, and the journey could be prolonged to Byzantium, an admirable centre for the indirect diffusion of the Gospel through the Roman world[10]. The new plan involved indeed a province falling into two widely separated groups of Churches with no important centre to unite them, and was thus far less convenient than the old one, since it involved a serious waste of time whenever the Apostles undertook a general visitation of their Churches; but it seemed the only possible alternative, since Asia was forbidden ground.

But as they neared the frontiers of Bithynia a fresh blow awaited them. The "Spirit of Jesus" would not allow them to enter it. This could only be interpreted as a proof that Paul's ambitious schemes for extending the Church in Asia did not meet with the divine approval[11]. It seemed that the journey was to end in nothing but the confirmation of the Churches of Galatia. The only course left was to make for the sea and return without accomplishing any new results at all[12]. The party made their way through Mysia to the port of Troas, from which they could without difficulty take ship to Syria. The hope that the new venture would mark a great advance in the conversion of the Gentile world had proved an ignominious failure.

At Troas the party fell in with a Christian convert who was passing through the port[13]. While they were waiting for a ship, however, Paul was summoned by a vision in the form of a dream to make a further change in his plans and to enlarge the scope of his journey

by a visit to Macedonia. The form of the vision rendered it open to doubt[14], and the suggestion might well seem impracticable. For his original scheme of a continuous Asiatic diocese, extending along the road from the Syrian Antioch to Ephesus, or the alternative Bithynian plan, both of which involved journeys of over 500 miles, Paul would commit himself to the establishment of a new group of Churches separated by more than 400 miles in a straight line from the Pisidian Antioch, the furthest point at which he had so far been able to establish a Christian community. Even that distance would only bring him to Philippi on the frontier of the province. Such new converts as he might make there would be entirely cut off from the older Christian societies; while, so long as he was forbidden to evangelize Asia, he would have in visiting them to make a long journey, which would be wasted so far as actual missionary work was concerned[15].

The suggestion made by the vision might well seem fantastic; none the less the party decided that it must be considered a message from heaven, and proceeded to obey it. A short voyage brought them to Neapolis, whence they made for Philippi. The town had a certain dignity as a colony, but commercially it was of no great account and could claim little importance except in the imagination of local patriots[16]. Paul had no intention of wasting his time by attempting any evangelistic work in it[17]. The Jewish population was small, and possessed no synagogue of its own, an open space on the bank of the river being used for purposes of worship by the few Jewish inhabitants and the converts, mostly women, whom they had attracted[18].

On the sabbath the party naturally made their way to this meeting-place, a stay of a few days having been decided on[19] after the fatigues of the long and fruitless journey from the Pisidian Antioch. Paul was unable to resist the opportunity of expounding his teaching to the women of the synagogue as they came together. The effect was sufficient to impress one of them, a proselyte of Thyatira, named Lydia, resident in the city, who offered to the party an invitation, too pressing to be refused, to stay in her house[20]. Thus against his original intentions Paul was committed to the founding of a Church at Philippi in return for her generosity. The smallness of the Jewish community and the fact that its leading member accepted the teaching of Paul resulted in the complete conversion of the local Jews to the new doctrines, and the Church took the place of Judaism without any open breach[21]. The mission continued peacefully for some time, since it appeared to the Gentile citizens to be identical

with the old Jewish propaganda, although exciting a certain amount of hostility on account of the new vigour which Paul's arrival infused into it[22].

The end, however, was sudden. A Gentile slave-girl, a lunatic credited with the possession of a spirit of divination, insisted on pointing the Apostles out on their journeys to the place of prayer as divinely appointed messengers of God[23]. The result was to cause them annoyance and undesirable notoriety; and to end the difficulty Paul commanded the spirit to come out of the girl. The cure was successful, a fact which naturally enraged the owners, whose valuable property was destroyed. They seized the missionaries, and dragged them before the magistrates. The charge brought against them was that they were carrying on a propaganda intended to convert Roman citizens to a foreign superstition[24], and the usual anti-Semitic prejudice of the Roman world enhanced by the appeal to local patriotism was sufficient to secure a condemnation. Paul and Silas were scourged with every mark of indignity and with no pretence of a trial[25]. An earthquake during the night caused the magistrates to regret their haste in dealing so harshly with persons possessed of such abnormal powers as the two missionaries; while the further discovery that they were Roman citizens changed the original order for their release into an abject apology. The apology was, however, coupled with a request for the departure of the Apostles, which could hardly be ignored[26]. They left the same day, their departure being rendered less difficult by the fact that the disciple who had accompanied the party from Troas to Philippi was in a position to remain behind and supervise the growth of the Church. There was therefore less danger to be apprehended from the sudden and enforced departure than had been the case in the communities founded by Paul on the earlier journey. It was further evident that the extension of his labours would make it exceedingly difficult to exercise a regular supervision of the new Church by periodical visits to Philippi; and it was natural to meet the situation by appointing a more or less permanent representative of high rank in the Church to act in the place of the founder of the community during the long periods of absence that were now inevitable. A precedent for such an action was furnished by the position of James the Lord's brother at Jerusalem. The stedfastness of the Philippian converts in later times was an ample vindication of the advantages of the system; but it was clearly probable that the number of Christians of such standing as to qualify them for the task was too small to allow of its general adoption for some time to come[27].

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI, SECTION III

1. The journey described in Acts xv. 36–xviii. 22 must open with the beginning of the travelling season, since S. Paul would hardly start a fresh venture without securing the fullest possible length of time for it. It would seem that his journey to Corinth occupies six months, and the eighteen months of his residence there occupy two winters and one summer, *i.e.* the period from the autumn of the year 50 to the spring of the year 52 (cf. c. v. § iv. n. 8, and below, § v. n. 36). In this case the "some days" of Acts xv. 36 represent the winter of the year 49–50 or so much of it as remained after the Council of Jerusalem.

It must, however, be observed that S. Luke is anxious for reasons explained below to emphasize the distinctness of this journey from the visit of the delegates from Jerusalem to Antioch. In point of fact he is incorrect in implying that it owed its origin to a fresh design on the part of S. Paul. If the narrative given above be correct it was rendered imperative by the success of the judaizing Christians in Galatia; and its necessity is admitted by implication in the fact that in Acts xvi. 4 the Apostles hand the letter to the Christians of these Churches. Whether it was possible to proceed further north than Antioch in winter is not clear. It was certainly impossible to proceed beyond Tarsus (cf. Ramsay in *J.R.S.* VII. 241). According to the same author in Hastings' *D.B.* I. 442, the pass, known as the Syrian gates, between Antioch and Tarsus (height 1980 feet), is very easy; but it is not clear whether this applies to all seasons. It may be noted indeed that we hear nothing of the delivery of the decrees to the Churches of Cilicia proper, and it is possible that they had been already delivered. This, however, is uncertain, since S. Luke takes no interest in them.

2. See Appendix on the Apostolate.

3. This is implied in Acts xvi. 37. It is, however, possible that S. Paul is using rhetorical language. After the scourging had been inflicted it mattered comparatively little whether both the victims were Roman citizens or only one. It would obviously be difficult for S. Paul to claim immunity, if by doing so he could escape punishment without saving his colleague. In the absence of evidence to the contrary it is, however, natural to interpret the language of Acts xvi. 37 in its strict sense.

4. See above, c. v. § iii. n. 22. The agreement that S. Paul and S. Barnabas should regard themselves as the Apostles of the Gentiles, with an authority equal to that of S. Peter as regards the Jews, was only part of a compact which had not been formally ratified by the Church and it might well be argued that all such private compacts were invalidated by the Council at Jerusalem. The Council had decided in favour of S. Paul, but it had also asserted the right of the whole community as against individual Apostles to decide in such matters. This explains the fact that S. Paul in his difficulties at Corinth has to deal with opponents who are Jews of high distinction in the Church (2 Cor. xi. 22 *seqq.*), and who challenge his authority as an Apostle (*ib.* xii. 11, and cf. 1. i. 12 *seqq.*, ix. 1 *seqq.*, and see below, c. VII. § iii. n. 10), but none the less are not maintaining the necessity of circumcision.

5. This is apparently the explanation of the passage Acts xv. 32–36. S. Luke never troubles about the movements of his characters except in so far as they are of importance to his main narrative. Thus S. Paul's visit to Arabia and his movements between Antioch and Tarsus are ignored, as are those of S. Peter between Acts xii. 17 and xv. 7. Similarly Silas disappears entirely after Acts xviii. 5. On this occasion, however, S. Luke carefully records the return of Judas Barsabbas and Silas to Jerusalem, and also the interval spent by S. Paul and S. Barnabas between their return to Antioch and the decision to make a fresh journey, which was in fact a necessity. It is instructive to compare his minuteness on this occasion with his compression of a whole journey from Ephesus to Jerusalem, Syria and Galatia into two verses at Acts xviii. 22, 23. It would obviously be easy for an opponent of S. Paul to represent his journey as a continuation of the mission of Silas and Judas to Antioch, and the rest of it, or at any rate his excursion outside Asia, as an unauthorized experiment.

This seems to be the reason for the care with which the movements of Silas are recorded and of the equally otiose *v.* 35, which emphasizes the independent

character of the Church of Antioch. If S. Luke had no such object in view he might have omitted the whole passage, *vv.* 33–35, without the smallest loss. As it is, he asserts, even at the cost of strict accuracy, the independence of the mission of SS. Paul and Silas of the mission of Silas to Antioch and the fact that the Antiochene community was quite able to carry on its activities without such aid as that of Judas Barsabbas and Silas. The Western interpolator, with his customary inability to understand the meaning of S. Luke, endeavours to obscure the whole sense by adding after *v.* 33 a new verse to the effect that Silas did not return but remained at Antioch (cf. § v. n. 13, c. VII. § i. n. 27, and § iii. n. 22).

6. Cf. c. I. n. 50 and c. IV. § i. n. 54.

7. For the relations of the Twelve to the primitive communities of Palestine cf. c. III. § ii. n. 20. We have no direct evidence that the Twelve had any special districts subject to them, but convenience would suggest it. S. Paul himself had worked in this way in Cilicia (c. v. § iii. nn. 2 *seqq.*). That it was his intention to visit Ephesus seems certain; he intended to visit Asia (this is implied in the fact that he was hindered in Acts xvi. 6), and he would hardly have stopped short of Ephesus. The journey involved in visiting a "diocese" extending from this city to the Syrian Antioch would amount approximately to 700 miles. According to Ramsay's estimate in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 386 of fifteen miles a day for travellers on foot, such a journey would take forty-seven days of actual travelling, while there would be some eleven or sixteen towns of a size likely to be regarded as suitable for preaching [according as the northern or southern route from the Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus was taken], between Tarsus and Ephesus (the latter city included). On the first journey to such a district no accurate estimate of the time needed could be framed, as the time spent in each city would vary with the openings for preaching, etc. At the time of this journey, however, there were only two between the Pisidian Antioch and Ephesus which had not been evangelized, if he chose the northern route, and seven, if he chose the southern. (These figures are based on the towns shown by Ramsay's map in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 400–401.) The remainder had been dealt with on earlier journeys or ignored as unimportant. If the larger figure be taken, S. Paul could hope to make the journey from one end of his "diocese" to the other and spend about ten days at each city every year, when once the first journey had been completed. He could winter at the Syrian Antioch or at Ephesus, if on arriving at the latter he found the season too far advanced to return to Syria by sea. Such a scheme, though ambitious, was feasible, especially as such communities as that of Tarsus had been established for a considerable period. It may also have been possible for S. Paul to hire conveyances, a point on which we have no information. It must be remembered that except for the journey from Tarsus to Derbe he would be travelling through a comparatively settled region, while in any case the main road would be comparatively safe. There would be considerably more difficulty and danger involved in journeys through the remote country districts of Palestine, as the stories of brigandage recorded by Josephus show. It may be regarded as probable that S. Paul would on this occasion have chosen the more populous southern route from the Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus, since on the preceding journey he had visited such small towns as Derbe. It is possible that he did in fact take this route on his later journey to Ephesus; but if so he did not preach on his way from the Pisidian Antioch owing to his desire to reach Ephesus (see below, c. VII. § i. n. 31).

8. For a full consideration of the advantages attaching to Ephesus as a missionary centre see below, c. VII. § ii. nn. 2 *seqq.*

9. With the reading διελθόντες the second participle κωλυθέντες cannot bear any sense of time, and it is probable that, even if διῆλθον was originally written, S. Luke did not intend it to be interpreted strictly. Historically it is unimportant whether the spiritual prohibition was a single one, preventing any attempt to preach in Asia, or whether S. Paul hoped, after abandoning Ephesus, to make his way to Smyrna or some other of the large Asiatic cities. It would, however, seem more likely that the journey northwards was begun in the hope of penetrating into Asia by one of the roads leading to some of the larger Asiatic cities such as Sardis or Smyrna, than that S. Paul immediately resolved to make for Bithynia.

10. Bithynia developed rapidly under the Empire, and by the end of the first

century was a stronghold of Christianity (Pliny, *Ad Tra.* 97, where it is stated that owing to the growth of the "superstition" the temples were almost deserted). Probably, however, it had not yet reached such a degree of civilization as to be a very favourable sphere for S. Paul's labours (*P.R.E.* I. 330; Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* I. 303 appears to antedate the development). It had, however, several important cities on the coast, notably Nicaea and Nicomedia, as well as Byzantium, which although on the European side of the Bosporus was included in the senatorial province of Bithynia and not in the Imperial province of Thrace, as appears from Tac. *Ann.* xii. 62. We read of Jews in Bithynia in Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 36 (M. II. 587). Schürer (*G.J.V.* III. 23) quotes a first-century Jewish epitaph from Panticapaeum in the Crimea, which records the existence of a synagogue there, and also traces other evidence of Jewish influence in these regions. Jews from them would pass through Byzantium on their way to the Aegean and the Levant, and it is therefore probable that S. Paul would find a Jewish colony there. On the other hand Bithynia was a very poor second-best to Asia in importance and in the number of Jewish residents. It had the further drawback that there was a long gap of over 160 miles between the Pisidian Antioch and Nicaea. The road was less important than the main routes into Asia, and was therefore likely to be less safe. There was no town on it suitable for preaching between the two, with the possible exception of Dorylaeum, where there is a doubtful Jewish inscription (*C.I.G.* 4129). On the southern route from Antioch to Ephesus there were numerous cities where Christianity found an early entrance. In this respect the Bithynian route was hopelessly inferior, while none of the cities on it approximated in importance to Ephesus.

11. It is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that "the Spirit of Jesus" describes some manifestation, regarded as coming from Our Lord, which differs from the prohibition of the Spirit, which debars the Apostles from working in Asia; but there is no evidence as to the form of that communication. It is important to notice the insistence thrown in the narrative on the fact that the course taken on the journey was dictated by divine authority. This may be due to the impression made on the writer's mind by the chain of coincidences which led to the meeting at Troas and the subsequent adventure into Macedonia. It is, however, possible that he is meeting by implication the criticisms levelled at S. Paul on account of his frequent changes of plan, especially in regard to this journey (cf. n. 5 above, and below, § v. n. 13).

12. The best MSS. emphasize the fact that S. Paul did not intend to preach after the failure to enter Bithynia by the use of παρελθόντες. That he did not in fact preach at Troas seems to be implied in 2 Cor. ii. 12, where S. Paul states that he came to Troas, intending to preach, and found great openings there. He would hardly express himself in this language if he had previously preached in the city. Since he had no intention of going to Macedonia apart from the vision it is only possible to infer that he intended to return to Syria, although the journey had produced no result beyond the confirmation of the Galatian Churches. There would be no object in founding an isolated community at Troas.

13. The author of the "we-sections" of the Acts, presumably S. Luke himself (see Introductory Note (*a*)). For the view that Acts xiv. 22 is intended to imply that he met S. Paul on the occasion of his return from Derbe to the Pisidian Antioch cf. above, § i. n. 37. In view of his traditional connection with Antioch, recorded in *H.E.* iii. 4, it would be conceivable to suppose that he was in fact a native of the Pisidian city, but transferred by a confusion to the Syrian. From Col. iv. 11 it has been inferred that he was not of Jewish origin, but the inference is doubtful. The phrase ἐκ περιτομῆς can hardly be pressed to mean more than Hebrew Christians, who had in the past been adherents of the anti-Pauline party, which had demanded the circumcision of the Gentiles, or might have been expected to do so; it is doubtful whether S. Paul would have regarded his fellow-Hellenists as being ἐκ περιτομῆς. He certainly is not to be identified with the person or persons named Lucius in Acts xiii. 1 and Ro. xvi. 21; apart from the difference of names, it is incredible that the writer who produced the "we-sections" of the Acts could have passed over the early history of the Church at Antioch so lightly, if he had played a prominent part in it. That he was a convert of some standing seems to be implied in the fact that he is concerned in the "conjecture," which results in the

journey to Macedonia (see next note). A convert just made would hardly be admitted to such close confidence, or expected to join the party. This cannot be asserted with absolute confidence in view of S. Paul's remarkable rapidity in dealing with his converts, as shown in the case of the gaoler at Philippi; but it seems hardly likely that a convert who had only known S. Paul during the period of the voyage to Philippi and the mission there would be left, apparently, in charge of the community (see below, n. 27). The evidence is in favour of his being a Jew of the Dispersion or a proselyte of some standing, who had been converted some time previously, and was known to S. Paul, at least by reputation, before the meeting at Troas.

14. Apparently the word *συμβιβάζοντες* is intended to imply that the vision was only accepted as a genuine divine summons after some consideration, resulting in the conjecture that a visit to Macedonia was commanded. In view of the drawbacks of such a scheme (see next note), such hesitation was only natural, especially as the vision did not directly take the form of a divine summons, as in the case of the dreams recorded in Acts xviii. 9, xxvii. 23. A "man of Macedonia" (presumably known as such by his invitation to visit that country) would be more open to suspicion than Our Lord or an angel appearing in a similar manner.

15. In Hastings' *D.B.* v. 385, Ramsay gives the distance from Troas to Antioch in Syria as 880 miles, with a three days' journey from Troas to Neapolis by sea, in all a two months' journey, excluding necessary periods of rest and the sabbaths on which S. Paul would not travel. Even so S. Paul would only be at the threshold of Macedonia. Apart from the actual distance of the journeys that the visitation of such a collection of Churches would involve, he would have to spend half of it in travelling through regions in which no Churches had been founded, while the cities already evangelized were not centres of such a character as to render it likely that Christianity would diffuse itself from them over the intervening area. The Pisidian Antioch was a centre for the region immediately surrounding it, as the other towns of "Galatia" would also be, but there was no considerable centre from which a large area could be affected nearer than Thessalonica. Thus S. Paul would have to devote a large part of his time to travelling in regions where he would be cut off from the society of fellow-Christians and would be unable to use the times when he was resting from his travels for the purpose of regulating the growth of his Churches. It is true that he did in fact succeed in dealing with an even larger area, but he was only able to do so for a short period, during which he was compelled to abandon the Syrian Antioch in favour of Ephesus and to employ his subordinates far more extensively than he had hitherto done.

It may further be remarked that the wide separation of the Churches would deprive their members of any means of assisting one another, and of the chance of being able to rely, when travelling, on the entertainment of fellow-Christians.

16. For the difficulties connected with the description of Philippi as *πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας* cf. Lightfoot's Introduction to his edition of the Epistle, p. 49, and Turner in Hastings' *D.B.* III. 837 *s.v.*, where further accounts of the city are given. On the whole the explanation seems to be that Philippi in virtue of its position as a colony prided itself on being the most important city of its own district and looked down on Amphipolis, which, since the gold mines of the district were worked out, was commercially of considerably more importance (cf. also Ramsay, *S. Paul the Traveller*, 206). The circumstances of its foundation by the triumvirs after their victory in 42 B.C. might well be sufficient reason for local pride of this kind, a pride which was stronger in regions outside the limits of Greece proper (*P.R.E.* I. 329). If this interpretation be accepted, it follows that Macedonia was still subdivided into *μερίδες* for administrative purposes; Philippi can hardly have considered itself more important than Thessalonica. S. Luke's share in this local pride seems to be due to his residence there during the period between S. Paul's departure for Thessalonica and his final voyage to Jerusalem.

It cannot be said that the Latin character of Philippi, or the Macedonian characteristics of the non-Latin population, are noticeably traceable in the Church of Philippi, which seems very similar in outlook to other Pauline communities. Thus the metaphor of citizenship in Phil. iii. 20 is no more applicable to a colony than the metaphor of Eph. ii. 19, where the *ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι* would well describe the legal relation of the native inhabitants to the Roman citizens of a

colony; but Ephesus was not a colony. Similarly the members of the Church, so far as they are known, Lydia, Euodias, Syntyche, Epaphroditus, and Clement, show only one Latin name. The games of Phil. ii. 16 and iii. 14 are Greek games, while the local Christians are liable to be led astray by their veneration for Judaism (Phil. iii. 2 *seqq.*). The persons whom S. Paul was likely to attract, whether at Philippi or elsewhere, were the denationalized trading classes, usually Jews, whose Judaism had been considerably weakened by intercourse with Gentiles, and freedmen or slaves who might come from any part of the world. The loyalty of the Philippians to S. Paul was probably due to the fact that they had been exceptionally well looked after in his absence (see n. 27).

17. That S. Paul had originally intended not to preach here appears from the language of Acts xvi. 12, 13. The statement that the party were spending some days in the city, and that they entered into conversation with the women who had met in the place of prayer by the river, is meaningless unless it is intended to show that S. Paul happened to be staying a few days and entered into a chance conversation intended rather to prepare the women for some future evangelist, than to explain in full the new development of Judaism. His reluctance to undertake such a step appears again in *παρεβιάσατο ἡμᾶς* in *v.* 15. The point is of some importance since S. Paul would appear, in view of the failure of his Asiatic schemes, to have abandoned his schemes for forming a group of Churches in reasonable proximity to one another and to have contemplated the policy, which he afterwards pursues, of appealing only to the large centres of civilization. This is confirmed by the fact that he passes by Amphipolis and Apollonia, his objective being Thessalonica (see below, § v. n. 2).

18. Schürer (*G.J.V.* II. 522) holds that there is no distinction of meaning between the words *συναγωγή* and *προσευχή*. It is, however, clear from the account in Acts xvi. 13 that the Jewish community meets not in a building but in the open air. (With the reading *ἐνομίζομεν* the suggestion is even stronger, since it would seem that it was only a conjecture that it was a Jewish meeting-place and that there was no certainty that any Jews would be found there.) Whether the term *προσευχή*, as such, implies an open meeting-place or not it is clear that the *προσευχή* of Philippi was not a building. This confirms the view that the Jewish colony was only a very small one.

19. This can only be conjectured, but it seems the natural explanation of the stay at Philippi. There had been no long delay at Troas (Acts xvi. 10, *εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν*), and the overland journey from the Pisidian Antioch to Troas, followed by the voyage, would demand some rest.

20. The language of Acts xvi. 13 suggests that there were only women. If this is intended to be the meaning it would appear that the Jews of Philippi consisted of Lydia and a few of her dependents, who met for prayer, and no Jewish families at all.

21. It seems from the absence of any allusion to Jewish opposition that the whole Jewish colony went over to Christianity. It would naturally be easier for them to take this step, where they were few and had not succeeded in making any impression on the Gentile world. Such a result is still more intelligible if the Jewish residents were limited to Lydia and a few of her dependents; in any case it is probable that the Jews of Philippi depended largely on her generosity for their support. The view that the Jews went over to Christianity in a body is confirmed by Phil. iii. 2 *seqq.*, where it is necessary for S. Paul to warn the Philippians against orthodox Jewish teachers, a danger which would hardly be a practical one, if there were in fact two hostile communities of Jews and Christians in existence. That S. Paul is writing in this passage against Jews, not against judaizing Christians, is evident from a comparison of the passage with 2 Cor. xi. 22 *seqq.* His emphasis is entirely on his claims to distinction as a Jew, and there is no allusion to his own position in the Church or to that of his opponents. They are Pharisees; and there is no evidence of a general opposition to S. Paul on the part of the small body of Christian Pharisees at Jerusalem (§ ii. n. 35); having failed at the Council, if indeed they ever hoped for success, they had no motive to encourage them to appeal to the Dispersion. There is, on the other hand, no allusion to S. Paul's claims as a Pharisee in 2 Cor., but an enumeration of his labours for the Gospel, the reason

being that his opponents do not profess to be more than Jews of the ordinary standard of piety, but have plausible claims to consideration as his equals in the Church.

This view is further confirmed by the fact that in Acts xvi. 16 the missionaries are still worshipping in the *προσευχή*. It seems that they maintain the use of the Jewish place of worship for those portions of Christian devotion which the Church took over from the synagogue. These would include the ordinary sabbath services and those on Mondays and Thursdays. The Agape and Eucharist could hardly be held in the open air. The advantages of such a maintenance of continuity would be obvious, since it would enable S. Paul to reach any Jew or Gentile adherent of Judaism who happened to be in Philippi on the sabbath. Although the Jewish colony was small Philippi stood on the *via Egnatia*, one of the main Roman routes of travel, and such people would often pass through the town.

22. The narrative of the riotous proceedings which accompany S. Paul's appearance before the magistrates suggests that he was already fairly notorious and unpopular, and this is confirmed by the story of the gaoler, who seems to know the Apostles by repute as religious teachers of eminence, and therefore responsible for the earthquake. Similarly the owners of the slave-girl describe the Apostles as throwing the city into confusion, which suggests that S. Paul had attracted a good deal of attention. Cf. also the action of the magistrates and its explanation in n. 25. The charge brought against them is of course not that they are teaching a new religion but trying to make proselytes to Judaism (see n. 24).

23. For the incident of the slave-girl cf. *S. Paul the Traveller*, p. 215. The desire for a better religion was common among the poorer classes of Graeco-Roman society, a fact which is abundantly proved by the successes of Christianity, Judaism and other religions. It must remain uncertain whether she knew them to be Jewish teachers or merely as the exponents of a new religion; *δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου* suggests a popular idea of Judaism; *σωτηρία* as deliverance from the powers that govern the fate of man or the material world is common ground in the cults of the time.

24. For the theory and practice of the Roman government towards foreign religions not accepted by the state, even though, like Judaism, they enjoyed a qualified recognition, see § i. n. 25. The charge here is not that the missionaries are preaching an unlawful religion, but that, being Jews, they are trying to convert Roman citizens (a colony being subject to the same laws as the city) to their own religion. It would seem that proselytizing was technically forbidden (cf. Val. Max. I. iii. 2 for the enforcement of this prohibition at an earlier date), but it would in practice be ignored unless it led to disorder. So here the ground for the action of the magistrates is that the Apostles are Jews who are causing trouble by proselytizing, not merely that proselytizing is illegal.

25. Apparently there was no sort of a trial, possibly because the facts were sufficiently notorious. The position of the magistrates would be a difficult one, if there was a serious disturbance, arising out of the activities of SS. Paul and Silas, and it could be shown that they had known before the riot of these illegal activities, without interfering. Hence they act without any formal trial in virtue of their general duty to preserve public order; their action could be justified by the illegal character of the activities of the Apostles, a fact which was too well known to demand investigation.

For the use of the word *στρατηγοί* to describe the *duoviri* of the town cf. Turner in Hastings' *D.B.* III. 838. The action of the magistrates in tearing off the Apostles' robes themselves, which is implied in the use of *περιρρήξαντες*, was apparently intended to express their horror at the offence, and so presumably to clear them from any suspicion of complicity or lack of vigilance in the matter. So Plutarch records of Cicero (*Vita* 36), *λέγεται δὲ μήτε ῥαβδοις αἰκίσασθαί τινα, μήτ' ἐσθῆτα περισχίσαι*, as a mark of his moderation, cf. Suet. *Cal.* 26, where Caligula's practice of tearing off the clothes of persons condemned to scourging is recorded as a sign of his brutality. The variant *περιρρηξάμενοι* is almost certainly a corruption, due to the common occurrence of the rending of clothes as a sign of abhorrence elsewhere in Scripture. For the practice among Romans cf. Juv. *Sat.* xiii. 132, and Suet. *Julius* 33. It seems to have been common to Romans and Jews.

26. The story of the earthquake, the conversion of the gaoler, and the release of the Apostles, is quite in harmony with the superstition of the time, if it is understood that the activity of the missionaries had attracted such attention in Philippi as to make it generally known that they were new religious teachers. The coincidence of the earthquake with their imprisonment would naturally be regarded as a proof of divine disapproval. Cf. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to M. Aurelius*, pp. 476 *seqq.*, for the superstitions of this and the succeeding ages.

27. The writer of the "we-sections" of the Acts remains at Philippi till Acts xx. 5, when he travels with S. Paul to Jerusalem. The party is made up of delegates from the various Pauline Churches, who are bearing their contributions to the Mother-Church. From 1 Cor. xvi. 4 it appears that the delegates are chosen from among the most prominent members of the communities (c. v. § iii. n. 15 and c. vii. § ii. n. 9). From this fact and those advanced in n. 13 it is natural to conjecture that he remained at Philippi to supervise the life of the community in S. Paul's absence. The community was probably not very large, and the Jewish element not sufficient to provide reliable leaders. Hence it is natural to see in him a ruler left to supervise the Philippians, whom S. Paul might not be able to revisit for some time. Whether there were presbyters to assist him or not at this stage does not appear. It is quite possible that the number of converts was so small that it was possible to leave them for the moment in his sole charge. S. Paul was quite capable of improvising such a form of government for one of his Churches, if it seemed more desirable to leave a single ruler than to appoint a college of presbyters. It is of course possible that S. Luke was in any case bound by other claims to remain at Philippi at the time, and that this fact contributed to the use made of him by S. Paul. In this case it would seem that the reasons which bound him to stay at Philippi on this occasion no longer held on the occasion of S. Paul's last voyage to Jerusalem.

§ iv. THE ROMAN CHURCH

It is necessary at this point to diverge from the history of Paul's wanderings to the development of Christianity in a different region[1]. Even before the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C. there had been a Jewish colony in Rome[2]; its numbers were enormously increased by the prisoners whom he brought from Judaea to adorn his triumph in 61 B.C. His captives were sold into slavery; but the Jewish national character was such as to render them useless to their purchasers[3]. Most of them were liberated after a very brief period of slavery, and many of those liberated returned to their native land[4]. Many, however, remained in Rome; and the Jewish colony grew steadily in numbers. Its members were firmly attached to the cause of Julius Caesar[5]; and their fidelity was rewarded after the troublous times of the civil war by the favour and patronage of Augustus and his minister Agrippa[6].

The communications between this body and their native country were peculiarly close. Apart from the yearly contributions conveyed by the leading members of it to Jerusalem, the position of Judaea as a subject kingdom dependent on the good will of the Emperor, and subsequently as a province suffering continually under the misgovernment of unsympathetic procurators, involved constant com-

munications between Jerusalem and Rome, in which the Jews of the Imperial city were always ready to stand by the cause of their native country[7]. The colony was thus in close connection with the mother-city; and the number of its members who had returned from their exile was sufficient to enable them to keep a synagogue of their own, called, in memory of the returned captives, who had first established it, "the synagogue of the freedmen[8]."

On the other hand the Jews who remained in Rome or emigrated thither from Palestine and the Dispersion, together with their proselytes and adherents of various kinds, were numbered by tens of thousands[9]. The attractions of the city had indeed resulted in many cases in the abandonment by the Jews of the national faith, or at least of the morality which it inculcated[10]. A similar state of affairs was to be found elsewhere among the Jews of the Dispersion, but it would naturally be more noticeable where the Jews formed almost a city of their own. Generally, however, the Roman Jews were zealous for their religion, and anxious to make proselytes among their Gentile neighbours[11]. In spite of the hostility of the conservative elements of Roman society, which still looked back to the time of the republic as the ideal period of Roman history, the efforts of the Jews were rewarded with a large amount of success[12]. Their proselytes were numerous, and many who were unwilling to commit themselves to Judaism to the full extent were interested in its teaching. These adherents included members of the highest families in Rome, mostly women, but the bulk of them were drawn from the lower classes of slaves and freedmen, who were most likely to come in contact with the Jews of the city[13]. The success of their propaganda intensified in the Jews the pride which they felt as the Chosen People of God, who alone protested effectively against the iniquities of the heathen around them—iniquities which they naturally attributed to the idolatry of their worship[14].

It was inevitable that Christianity should find its way into these circles, as it extended through the Jews of the Dispersion. As an obscure Messianic sect which accepted the Law in the old sense and sought to impose it on its proselytes it was not likely to cause any stir in Rome. The political motives which led the Sadducees to persecute it were not shared by the Jews of the Dispersion, and in this form it could continue without notice and without effect on the Gentile world in Rome no less than in Palestine[15].

As a serious new force in religion Christianity could only make itself felt in the world at large in the form developed at Antioch by

Paul and his fellow-Hellenists. In this form it was first preached in Rome in A.D. 49–50, almost at the very time when the Council of Jerusalem was deciding once and for all whether the Gospel was to continue to unite itself to the old system of Judaism, or to assert that freedom from the past which Paul claimed for it[16]. The message of the new teachers was first proclaimed at one of the synagogues of Rome; in view of a curious passage in the letter written by Paul a few years later it is tempting to conjecture that it was first preached at the synagogue known as "the synagogue of the Olive[17]." Here as elsewhere the nature of the new teaching, as soon as it was clearly understood, provoked the most violent hostility. The Jews were not for a moment prepared to admit the equality of the Gentiles. By accepting the Law they could indeed deliver themselves from the curse laid on the heathen, but they could only regard themselves as the inferiors of those who by birth were the children of Abraham. Still less could it be admitted that Gentiles who refused to accept the full burden of the Law could share in the privileges of the Chosen People[18]. The Jews, except in so far as they had accepted the new revelation[19], rose in anger against so monstrous a doctrine, and endeavoured by violence to put an end to the teaching of the new blasphemies.

Of the initial stages of the struggle we have no direct evidence; we may conjecture that it took the following course during the period which preceded the outbreak of rioting which drew down upon the Jews the anger of the Imperial government. The Jews (including proselytes and loosely attached adherents of Judaism) who had accepted the new system of teaching formed a considerable proportion of the whole synagogue in which it had first appeared, and they showed no disposition to allow themselves to be expelled from it without a struggle. Just as the new teaching proclaimed itself to be the true fulfilment of the old, so they claimed that they, and not those who rejected Christianity, were the true synagogue, entitled to use the name, and with it the recognized right to existence in the city[20]. The synagogues of Rome were independent bodies, and the colony as a whole had no organization of its own, or none which enjoyed any legal recognition, as had the Jewish colony at Alexandria; and it was therefore unable to intervene effectually in the matter.

The Jews, however, were not to be silenced. In their zeal for the religion of their fathers they sought by violent attacks on the converts either to force them to abandon their new beliefs, or else to secure their suppression by the authorities as responsible for the disturbance

of the peace of the city. The course was a dangerous one. A scandal during the reign of Tiberius had led to a large deportation of Jews from Rome[21], and although Claudius had always treated the Jews with toleration[22] yet he was not likely to overlook serious disturbances. The riots failed to put an end to the new preaching but succeeded in attracting the notice of the government. The inquiries made into their origin revealed the fact that they were concerned with a question of Jewish laws and superstitions, and their interpretation by a certain "Chrestus." Such matters were obviously beneath the notice of the Imperial authorities, and the difficulty was solved by an edict ordering the departure of all Jews from Rome and Italy[23].

An edict of this character was, however, too sweeping to be obeyed, and in fact could only be enforced on a few of the ringleaders in the rioting on each side. Among those sufficiently well known as implicated in the matter to be affected were two Christians of Jewish origin, Aquila and his wife Priscilla, natives of Pontus and resident in Rome, who found it expedient to emigrate for the time to Corinth[24]. The edict naturally affected the Jewish Christians more severely than those who adhered to the old religion, since their principles inculcated absolute obedience to the civil power, while they were deprived of the protection of their wealthier fellow-countrymen, who had not been implicated in the disturbances and had little difficulty in evading the new edict[25]. Its enforcement was not likely to be taken seriously except in the case of those responsible for the incidents which had evoked it.

Within a brief period Christianity was able to resume its propaganda in Rome as freely as before. The legal claim to the title of the synagogue of the Olive remained undecided. The incident, however, left its mark on the Roman community. The Jewish Christians found themselves cut off from the society of their fellow-countrymen, while the Gentile converts were inclined to change their old respect for their Jewish leaders into a vigorous assertion of equality, which was in fact an implication of superiority[26]. The action of the Roman government had also produced a feeling of bitterness which tended to a dangerous attitude of hostility to established authority. Such an attitude might easily lead to developments which would be a dangerous hindrance to the propagation of the Gospel[27].

From another point of view the riots might easily prove a somewhat serious set-back. The Jews throughout the Empire would naturally blame the Church for the inconveniences caused by the edict, since they would hold the Church responsible for the riots. At the same

time the fact of the riots could be used as damaging evidence against Christian teachers in Gentile courts[28]. It was not easy for the Christians to deny the responsibility for the disturbances at Rome before a magistrate who was not prepared to investigate their claim to be the true representatives of the Jewish faith; and outside Palestine it was certain that no court could be found, which would dream of devoting its attention to the matter. The result was that for the moment the Jews had a useful weapon against the teaching of Christianity, and at the same time every motive for using whatever means were at their disposal for suppressing the teaching which had brought trouble on them at Rome.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI, SECTION IV

1. For a fuller account of the history of the Jewish colony in Rome cf. *G.J.V.* III. 57, and the literature referred to there.

2. Cic. *Pro Flacco* 28.

3. Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 23 (M. II. 568).

4. This follows from the identification of the synagogue of the Libertines in Acts vi. 9 with a synagogue for Roman Jews, who had returned to Jerusalem. The name of Libertines would only be given to such a synagogue if it was started at a time when there were a large number of Jews who had recently been freed from captivity in Rome.

Jewish emigrants returning from Rome would not so describe themselves, unless the original founders had been taken to Rome as prisoners; and the triumph of Pompey was the only occasion that could be responsible for the taking of so large a number of prisoners that those of them who returned could found and maintain a synagogue of their own. It would seem therefore that a number of his captives must have returned at about the same time, and so given the name to the synagogue (cf. *G.J.V.* II. 502).

5. Suet. *Julius* 84. For the benefits conferred by Caesar on the Jewish nation cf. *Antt.* XIV. X.

6. This is apparently the explanation of the "Augustensian" and "Agrippensian" synagogues in Rome. The names are found in the oldest Roman cemetery, and appear to be due to the fact that the members of the synagogues regarded the Emperor and the minister as their patrons. (Schürer regards them as consisting of slaves and freedmen of Augustus and Agrippa, but it is somewhat doubtful whether Jews would have been in such request as slaves as to provide enough in one household for a synagogue.) For the inscriptions in question cf. *C.I.G.* 9902, 3, *C.I.L.* VI. 29757 (Augustensians), *C.I.G.* 9907 (Agrippensians). For the patronage shown by Augustus and Agrippa to the Jews cf. also Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 23 (M. II. 568), 37 (M. II. 589), *Antt.* XVI. VI.

7. For such embassies, in which the Jews of Rome support the cause of the envoys from Palestine, cf. *Antt.* XVII. XI. 1, *Vita* 3. It is only natural to suppose that the Jews of Rome assisted on the occasion of the numerous other embassies recorded by Josephus in the course of this period, at least to the extent of providing hospitality to the delegates of the authorities of Jerusalem.

8. See above, n. 4.

9. Tacitus (*Ann.* ii. 85) records that in A.D. 19 a decree of the Senate was passed *ut quattuor millia libertini generis ea* (*Judaica*) *superstitione infecta, quis idonea aetas, in insulam Sardiniam veherentur.* Suetonius (*Tiberius* 36) describes the same event: *Judaeorum iuventutem per speciem sacramenti in provincias gravioris coeli distribuit; reliquos gentis eiusdem vel similia sectantes urbe submovit, sub poena perpetuae servitutis nisi obtemperassent.* It is to be noticed that according to the account of Tacitus those so deported were those "infected with the Jewish superstition," who were of

the status of freedmen; if he is correct many of those concerned must have been proselytes and adherents of Judaism. Suetonius, on the other hand, describes them as being in all cases Jews by race, proselytes being banished from the city with the Jews not of military age. Josephus gives the same figures as Tacitus, apparently applying them to Jews alone. It is therefore doubtful whether the number given includes proselytes, or refers only to those who were of Jewish origin. In any case, however, the fact that there were four thousand Jews and proselytes of this class alone implies a whole Jewish population of at least twenty thousand. Josephus records the fact that in 4 B.C. eight thousand Jews supported the ambassadors sent from Palestine to oppose the succession of Archelaus (*Antt.* XVII. xi. 1). His figures are as a rule grossly exaggerated, but in this instance the number is comparatively moderate.

10. c. I. n. 50. It is to be remembered that many of the slaves and servants employed by members of the Herodian family in Rome would be of Jewish extraction, but not likely to be more noticeable for their piety than were their employers.

11. Ro. ii. 17 *seqq.*, and cf. c. I. nn. 57–59.

12. The Roman dislike of Judaism, which meets us in Tac. *Hist.* v. 5, Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 96 *seqq.*, Cic. *Pro Flacco* 67, Pliny, *N.H.* xiii. 9, proceeds essentially from the conservative element of Roman society, whether aristocratic or *bourgeois*, while the Imperial policy, up to the time of Tiberius, favoured them. It was natural for the Jews to support the Empire as making for peace and a centralized government which relieved them from the danger of oppressive local regulations. Judaism, on the other hand, in the eyes of conservative Romans stood for the cosmopolitanism of the Empire which they disliked (cf. Juv. *Sat.* iii. 16, 62, Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44).

13. Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85. For Romans of the higher class attracted to Judaism, or to Christianity when it was still regarded as a form of Jewish "superstition," cf. § i. n. 9; for the social status of the majority of Roman Jews see Juv. *Sat.* iii. 18. The early Christian converts appear to be drawn from slaves and freedmen (cf. Ro. xvi. 10, 11, Phil. iv. 22, and for the former passage cf. c. VIII. § i. n. 24).

14. Cf. c. I. n. 49 and c. IV. § i. Appendix I.

15. It would be strange if Hebrew Christian or Roman Jews converted to the Hebrew view of Christianity on the occasion of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem did not visit Rome and preach the Gospel there before the disturbances of the reign of Claudius, in view of the close relations between the Jews of the two cities. But their teaching would not naturally excite very much interest among the Gentiles, nor any violent opposition among the Jews. In any case we have no evidence on the point. For the legend that S. Peter came to Rome in the reign of Tiberius and that he resided there for twenty-five years cf. Chase in Hastings' *D.B.* III. 769 *seqq.*, Art. "Peter (Simon)."

16. The first record of the appearance of Christianity in Rome is the notice of Suetonius (*Claudius* 25), *Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit*. The expulsion followed a somewhat lengthy period of disturbances (*assidue*). The date of this expulsion is stated by Orosius (VII. vi. 15) as the ninth year of Claudius, *i.e.* A.D. 49, but the account he gives is not above suspicion as he professes to derive the date from Josephus, who does not in fact record this expulsion at all. That his date is not far from the mark is proved by the fact that Aquila and Priscilla arrive in Corinth shortly (*προσφάτως*) before S. Paul. S. Paul reached Corinth some time in the autumn of A.D. 50. (For this date in relation to the proconsulate of Gallio, from July 51 to July 52 A.D., see below, § v. n. 36.) If S. Paul reached Corinth in the autumn of 50 the edict which led to the departure of Aquila and his wife from Rome must have fallen earlier in the year. The edict had been preceded by a period of continuous rioting, due to the activities of the first Hellenistic missionaries, a period which must more or less coincide with S. Paul's journey from Antioch in Syria to Thessalonica. This is confirmed by the fact that the Jews of Thessalonica know of the riots in Rome, and possibly of the edict (see below, § v. n. 6). Thus the first preaching of Christianity in Rome coincides at the latest with the beginning of the journey, and probably should be dated some months earlier. For the missionaries would hardly go to Rome unless they were prepared to stay there for some time; and if so, they would probably unfold their message

gradually, as did S. Paul at Ephesus, where, with a long stay in prospect, he takes three months to quarrel with the synagogue. Such a method would be likely to secure more Jewish converts than a rapid mission. It is therefore by no means improbable that the first preachers of the Hellenist form of Christianity arrived in Rome at the time when the Council of Jerusalem was in progress; and this possibility suggests that the mission to Rome was due to the deliberate action of the Church of Antioch and intended to counteract the outbreak of judaizing activity, which led to the Council. This, however, is pure conjecture, and it would be equally possible to suppose that it was undertaken immediately after the result of the Council became known, in view of the fact that the last obstacle to the conversion of the Gentiles was now removed. It is, however, unsafe to press such conjectures.

17. For the existence of a synagogue of the Olive or Olive-tree (*συναγωγὴ τῆς Ἐλαίας*) see *C.I.G.* 9904. Since this inscription occurs in the same cemetery with epitaphs of the "Agrippensians," who are hardly likely to have retained their name after the memory of their patron had been forgotten, it would seem to follow that the cemetery dates from the first century A.D. If so it is natural to find in this the explanation of S. Paul's otherwise inexplicable simile of the olive-tree in Ro. xi. 17 *seqq.* That simile, as the commentators point out, is hopelessly far-fetched, since the proper process is not to graft the branches of the wild olive on to the cultivated tree, but the reverse. Further, the simile would be entirely without interest to an audience drawn from the urban proletariat of Rome, who would for the most part have not the smallest interest in the methods of cultivating olive-trees. If, on the other hand, the original preaching of Christianity had taken place in the synagogue of the Olive and the Gentile converts whom S. Paul is here addressing had claimed in the past, and were possibly still claiming, to be the synagogue of the Olive, the whole passage assumes a reasonable appearance. There is a tendency among the Gentiles to look down on the Jews, and S. Paul reminds his readers that though they are at the moment the true synagogue of the Olive, yet the old branches of the cultivated tree, *i.e.* the Jewish members of the synagogue of the Olive, are really their superiors and are not to be despised, as though God had finally rejected them. [Even if the allusion to the "synagogue of the Olive" be rejected, the general course of events may safely be presumed to be that described in the text.]

18. Cf. c. IV. § i. nn. 56, 57.

19. It is clear from the fact that S. Paul is mainly occupied in Romans in clearing away misconceptions from the mind of Jewish readers that the number of Jewish converts at Rome was considerable.

20. This seems the natural course for events to take, whether the identification of the scene of the first Christian preaching in Rome with the "synagogue of the Olive" be correct or not. If, however, the hypothesis advanced in n. 17 be correct, the connection of the Church with that synagogue must have amounted to more than the mere fact that it was the scene of the first preaching of the faith in the city. Otherwise it would have ceased to be of interest by the time when the Epistle was written. But it has already been noticed that S. Paul's view is that Christianity is the true version of Judaism (c. IV. § i. n. 36). The point is not only one of theological theory, but also of practical legal importance (§ i. n. 26). Similarly, if the converts of the synagogue of the Olive, whether Jews or proselytes, formed a large proportion of the members, it would be a considerable advantage to them if they claimed that they were legally entitled to the name, and possibly even to the building of the synagogue of the Olive, and the simile would retain its interest for S. Paul's readers. At Rome each synagogue would appear to have been a separate corporation, and the Jews as a whole had not the same measure of recognition which they enjoyed elsewhere. Consequently the Jewish community would not have any legal right over one particular synagogue. (For the whole position of the Jews at Rome in this respect cf. *G.J.V.* III. 81 *seqq.*) At Alexandria, the other great centre of the Jewish Dispersion, the opposite situation was to be found, the Jews being organized as an independent community with a ruler, known as the ethnarch, and a senate of their own. It is to be observed that there is no evidence that the Jews in Rome were ever recognized formally as enjoying a peculiar position, except that on occasions when public distributions were made on the sabbath, and the Jews

were therefore unable to come for their share, they were permitted to come on the following day. Philo, who records this fact in his panegyric of Augustus in *Leg. ad Gaium* 23 (M. II. 568), says nothing of any other formal recognition of the position of the Jews, and merely records that he did not in fact interfere with them or their religious practices, although he was aware of their existence. Josephus records numerous official pronouncements recognizing the right of the Jews to meet in the synagogue, to collect money for the Temple and to forward it to Jerusalem, and to be exempt from military service, but all these are addressed to the provinces of the Empire as a whole, or to particular cities. The only allusion to any recognition of their position at Rome is in *Antt.* XIV. x. 8, where it is stated that they were exempted from the decree of Julius Caesar for the suppression of *collegia*. This exemption, however, does not amount to any formal concession of particular privileges, such as those enjoyed at Alexandria. It may be presumed that it was considered inexpedient to grant such privileges in the city itself.

21. Cf. n. 9 for the accounts of this deportation in Tacitus and Suetonius. The scandal which led to it is recorded in *Antt.* XVIII. iii. 5, and it would appear that there is an allusion to it in Ro. ii. 22. The Jews implicated in it, four in number, persuaded a certain Fulvia, a wealthy proselyte, to entrust them with a large donation for the Temple at Jerusalem, and proceeded to embezzle it. Obviously the antithesis in Ro. ii. 22 is much more pointed if the words *ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἴδωλα ἱεροσυλεῖς*; are translated "Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou rob the Temple," rather than "dost thou rob temples" or "commit sacrilege," as in the English versions. The Jewish abhorrence of idolatry would naturally tend to condone the robbing of heathen temples, rather than to make it a worse offence, and the point of the passage is that the sins of the Jews are intensified by the fact that they do not practise what they preach. On the other hand abhorrence of idolatry would enhance the guilt of robbing the Temple of the one true God. This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that the question stands last of the three questions which illustrate in an ascending order the failure of the Jew of the Dispersion to live up to the standard of the Law which he ought to proclaim to others. The robbing of heathen temples could hardly be regarded as being worse than adultery, in the same way as adultery is worse than theft; but the robbing of the Temple at Jerusalem would naturally be considered in this light.

S. Paul's readers would remember the incident and understand his allusion on account of the magnitude of the disaster, which involved not merely the enrolment of many Jews for compulsory military service, but the punishment of many who refused to serve. Its importance is shown by the fact that Sejanus, who was mainly responsible for it, earned by his action a place in Philo's gallery of persecutors, who had been overtaken by divine vengeance. His book on the subject is lost, but there is an allusion to the event in *Leg. ad Gaium* 24 (M. II. 569).

22. For the edict of Claudius in favour of the Jews cf. *Antt.* XIX. v. 3. A similar edict appears from the passage in Philo mentioned in the preceding note to have been issued by Tiberius after the fall of Sejanus. Both edicts appear to have been addressed to the world at large and do not confer any specific privileges on the Jews in Rome.

23. The language of Suetonius has been interpreted as implying that the riots were not due to the preaching of Christianity, but to the activities of an otherwise unknown person of the name of Chrestus. This suggestion fails to explain why the expulsion of all Jews should be ordered, since Claudius was generally not unfavourable to the Jews, and it would have been an easy matter to punish Chrestus and his supporters. The action taken indicates that a large number of Jews were concerned and that the exact cause could not be ascertained, with the result that all the Jews were punished indiscriminately. This would be the natural action of a Roman magistrate, when called on to decide whether the Christian revelation had or had not superseded the old Judaism; he would naturally, like Gallio, refuse to hear the arguments on such a point, and, since there had been serious rioting, punish all the offending parties alike.

The exact scope of the edict is a matter of some dispute. S. Luke describes it as an order commanding all Jews to leave Rome. Dio Cassius, lx. 6, describes it as simply a prohibition of public worship. (For his chronology cf. *G.J.V.* III. 62.)

In this case the departure of Aquila and Priscilla would be merely due to the fact that they preferred leaving Rome to remaining when the worship of the Church was prohibited in common with that of the Jews, as would inevitably be the case. (It is, of course, possible that they were not in fact Christians at the time, see note following.) On the other hand it is difficult to suppose that such a prohibition would be easier to enforce than an order to depart. The worship of the synagogue was so important an element in the life of the Jews of the Dispersion that its prohibition would have been almost equivalent to the expulsion of the whole Jewish nation. S. Luke has also the support of Suetonius. It would seem most in accordance with the evidence to suppose that an edict ordering the departure of all Jews was issued, but that in fact it was only seriously enforced against the ringleaders. Such a course would have the advantage that, in the case of any further disturbances, any Jews implicated in them could without any further inquiry be treated as guilty of disobeying the edict, and would therefore have no possible defence. A similar means of keeping in check a danger which could not be suppressed is found in the case of the *collegia* (cf. § i. n. 25), and is characteristic of governments which are faced with evils which they cannot suppress. The account of Dio may preserve a record that the troubles originated in the religious quarrels of the Jewish community. For a similar decree, which it was found impossible to enforce, cf. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 52.

24. It is difficult to suppose that Aquila and Priscilla were not already Christians, as it is improbable that Jews who had been concerned in the disturbances at Rome as violent opponents of the new teaching would listen to it at Corinth. Further, since S. Paul spent some time with them, while he was only preparing the ground in the synagogue for a fuller statement of his teaching (see below, § v. n. 25), we should expect his hosts to be the first of his converts, since he would be likely to explain to them first what his doctrines really involved. But it appears from 1 Cor. xvi. 15 that the house of Stephanas was "the firstfruits of Achaea," *i.e.* either that the household of Stephanas was converted before that of Aquila, or that the household of Aquila was converted outside Achaea, before it migrated to Corinth. Thus the balance of probability is very strongly in favour of the view that they were Christians before they met S. Paul. S. Luke avoids all mention of the reason for their departure from Rome, presumably on the ground that the incident would not be a very good testimonial for Christianity in the eyes of Gentile readers. Hence we find no allusion in the Acts to the history of the Roman Church before S. Paul's arrival, although its existence is recognized in Acts xxviii. 15.

The fact that an expulsion of Christian Jews has intervened between the foundation of the Roman Church and the writing of the Epistle to the Romans renders it unsafe to regard Andronicus and Junias in Ro. xvi. 7 as the founders, or at least the first Apostles, of the Roman Church. Otherwise the conjecture would be highly probable. In any case they are Hellenist Jews, who have been in prison with S. Paul, presumably on the occasion of his labours in Cilicia. Since they are of note among the Apostles and senior to S. Paul in order of conversion, they are Christians of very high standing. They would thus be well qualified to be sent from Antioch to Rome, either to preach the Gospel or to regulate the affairs of a community already collected by the efforts of Christian emigrants from Syria to Rome of a lower rank in the Church. It is, however, possible that the first missionaries of note shared the fate of Aquila and Priscilla. (For the reasons which are decisive against the separation of the later chapters of the Epistle from the rest see below, c. VIII. § i. n. 24.)

25. That there was no general enforcement of the edict is agreed. It is likely that the earlier converts would not be of very high rank or wealth, any more than at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 26), and elsewhere (Acts xiii. 50, 2 Cor. viii. 2). For the Christian attitude to the civil government cf. Ro. xiii. 1, 1 Peter ii. 13.

26. Although it is natural that S. Paul should address his *apologia* to the Roman Church, on the ground that its Jewish members were drawn from the largest settlement of the Dispersion with the possible exception of Alexandria, yet it is clear that he expects his readers to feel some doubt as to his action in abandoning the Law. This is probably due to the fact that they are more than ordinarily cut off from their fellow-countrymen, and are therefore more likely than others to

doubt the justifiability of their action in accepting Christianity without the Law. That the Gentiles are inclined to look down on the Jews is implied in Ro. xi. 13 *seqq.*

27. See above, n. 25. It is to be presumed that some members of the Church tended to ignore the official Christian view as to the duty of obedience to authority, since it is necessary for S. Paul to insist on it so strongly.

28. See below, § v. n. 6.

§ v. MACEDONIA AND ACHAEA

The news of the situation at Rome had already spread to the Jews of the Dispersion in the neighbouring provinces, when Paul was compelled to leave Philippi. The failure of his earlier scheme had made it evident that it was not the divine purpose that he should devote himself to the evangelization of a continuous geographical area, and he therefore passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia without preaching in them to Thessalonica, the capital of the province of Macedonia. The city was the natural commercial centre of one of the most flourishing provinces of the Empire, and possessed a considerable Jewish population[1]. Its size and the fact that it was the seat of the provincial government might well encourage the missionaries to hope for immunity from the persecution of provincial magistrates, liable to be dominated by Jewish influences. The hope was not realized[2]. In his anxiety to avoid too long an absence from the main centres of Christian life in Antioch and Jerusalem Paul proceeded to develop at once his teaching that Jesus was the Messiah and the inferences which he based on the facts of His death and Resurrection[3]. His teaching was recognized as identical with that which had led to the disturbances at Rome, and although a certain number of Jews, and still more of their Gentile adherents[4], were converted, the majority of the Jews were roused to violent hostility. They succeeded within three weeks[5] of the opening of Paul's mission at Thessalonica in stirring up a riot among the mob of the city, hoping to get rid of the obnoxious teaching by a personal attack on one of its leading exponents. They failed, however, in their attempt to find Paul and had to be content with seizing his host and some other converts and bringing them before the local magistrates. In the city court they charged their prisoners with entertaining those responsible for the rioting at Rome[6], and added the charge that the teaching of the missionaries was directly aimed at the safety of the Empire, since it sought to proclaim a rival Emperor[7]. The latter charge was infinitely the more serious, and was based on indiscreet allusions by Paul to the "kingdom of God." This phrase had played a large part

in the accusations brought against Jesus Himself, although in Palestine it was less open to misconstruction than elsewhere. In that country the title of king was commonly applied to the subject-princes of the Herodian dynasty, and was therefore not as a rule used to designate the reigning Emperor. It was, however, generally used in this sense in Hellenic countries, and consequently Christian preachers found it desirable to avoid the use of such phrases as "the kingdom of God" for fear either of misunderstanding or wilful misconstruction[8]. Paul, however, had allowed himself to forget this precaution in the course of his mission, in which he had dealt largely in eschatological pronouncements. The politarchs were, however, content to exact from Jason, Paul's host, and his fellow-prisoners a bond that they would not give any further shelter to dangerous characters[9]. The accusation was too much exaggerated for the magistrates to take it seriously, and they took the easiest course by arranging for the departure of those responsible for the public excitement, without inquiring into the merits of the case. The excitement, however, was such that the Apostles were forced to leave the town with the utmost haste and secrecy[10].

The haste of his departure, and the brief time during which he had been able to instruct his converts, made it difficult for Paul to travel far from Thessalonica. His anxiety as to their future led him to break his journey at Beroea. The town was not of the first importance, but it possessed a synagogue, where he could spend some time profitably in preparing the minds of the Jews for a fuller exposition of the Gospel, while waiting for an opportunity to return to Thessalonica, when the excitement had subsided[11].

The Jews of Beroea were inclined to listen with interest to his exposition of the Messianic teaching of the prophets, and a certain number of converts were made, both among the Jews and among their Gentile sympathisers, without any breach between the Christians and the synagogue. Unfortunately the distance of Beroea from Thessalonica was too small to enable him to remain there without attracting the attention of his enemies in the capital of the province. Emissaries arrived from Thessalonica to stir up the Jews of Beroea into a disturbance which would at least secure his expulsion from the city. Paul was too wise to wait for them, since any adverse legal decision might render it difficult for him to return to Beroea, if at any future time he needed it as a starting-point for a fresh visit to Thessalonica. He decided to leave the province at once, while Silas and Timothy could remain to complete the organization of the Beroean

community. Timothy indeed, though less experienced than the Apostles, could also assist the Christians of Thessalonica, since owing to his comparative obscurity he had not been included in the bond exacted by the magistrates and was not likely to be recognized by Paul's enemies in the city[12].

The situation was by no means an easy one. Paul was anxious to return to Syria as soon as possible, since the time allotted for the mission under his original scheme had almost expired, and it was possible that his opponents in Judaea were raising fresh difficulties. His funds were running short, since he had no means of communicating with his friends in the East; he was at the moment living on the voluntary support of his converts at Philippi. At the same time he could not venture to return until he was rejoined by his companions, who were themselves unable to leave Macedonia until they had placed the local communities on a basis of such security as to ensure their fidelity until he was able to return. In the complete confusion of his plans it was very doubtful when, if ever, an opportunity for a second visit would arise[13].

Escorted by some of his Beroean converts Paul made his way to Athens by sea[14]. Thence his new friends returned with orders to Silas and Timothy to rejoin him as soon as possible. There was little reason for supposing that the Gospel would find any large opportunity in the city. There was a Jewish colony of some size, attracted more by the numerous visitors of every class, who resorted to the city, than by its commercial importance. Judaism, however, was not likely to find at Athens any very large number of Gentile adherents[15]. The Athenians prided themselves on their position as the centre of Gentile culture and learning and also on their piety. The latter quality rendered them willing to admit the cult of any new deity, but this habit of mind did not in any way diminish their devotion to the forms of worship which had been the pride of the city in the days of its greatness. Consequently a creed which denounced the whole of those forms as childish, if not evil, was not likely to find any enthusiastic acceptance among them[16]. Although the Jews had Gentile adherents[17], they were less likely to permeate Athens with their views to any large extent than any other Gentile city. Since, however, Paul had no intention of breaking any new ground until he had returned to Syria, he had no need to consider such questions and could gratify his natural desire to see a city which was one of the wonders of the world. Timothy rejoined him soon after his arrival; but Paul was too anxious as to the state of affairs at Thessalonica to

retain him, and sent him back to Macedonia in order to ascertain how his converts had fared under the persecution which the circumstances of his departure rendered more or less inevitable[18].

In spite, however, of his original intention, Paul found himself unable to abstain from preaching the Gospel at Athens. The city whose inhabitants claimed it as the centre of Hellenic culture and Hellenic piety seemed to him merely given over to idolatry, an impression which his familiarity with Gentile philosophy, as transmitted through Jewish attempts to reconcile it with the Mosaic system, could only intensify[19]. In the Jewish synagogue on the sabbath he felt himself constrained to testify against the idolatry of the city, and to contrast with it the new revelation which had ratified the truth of the refusal of the Chosen People to be partakers in the worship of the nations around them[20]. Nor was this all; it was easy for him to enter into conversation with the philosophers and would-be philosophers who crowded the Agora. To some of these he endeavoured to expound his system. He naturally seemed to his hearers to be interested in the propagation of a new cult of Jesus and a new system of proving the immortality of the soul. He was in consequence requested to make a formal statement of his views to some of the leading teachers of the city[21]. Taking as his text an altar dedicated to "The Unknown God," which he had noticed in the streets of the city, he proceeded to expound to his audience the doctrine that their Unknown God was in fact the one true God, whose existence was recognized as necessary by the best of their own philosophers and poets[22]. This one God had now revealed Himself to man in the person of Jesus, by Whose Resurrection from the dead He had proved both the divine authority of His messenger and the future resurrection of all men. The audience were divided in their views of such a system of philosophy, some being not unsympathetic. Paul, however, had no desire to commit himself to a serious attempt to convert the philosophers of Athens. A few converts were made, and without endeavouring to do more than to organize them as a nucleus for possible work in the future, he went on to Corinth, leaving word for his companions to join him there[23].

At Corinth he was fortunate enough to fall in with two of the Jewish Christians expelled from Rome, Aquila and Priscilla[24]. They were tent-makers and Paul himself had been brought up to the trade and was therefore able to pay for his living while waiting for his companions. Meanwhile he was able to prepare the minds of the Jews of the synagogue and their Gentile adherents for some future

time when the full Gospel could be laid before them, by speaking to them of the Messianic promises contained in the Jewish Scriptures and the manner in which they were to look for their fulfilment[25]. Corinth offered him golden prospects, if he should at any future date be able to settle there for a mission of any duration[26]. The existing city, although nominally a Roman colony, had, on account of its situation at the junction of the sea-routes between the Adriatic and the Aegean, inevitably developed a peculiarly cosmopolitan character. For the same reason it was the largest city of Hellas proper, but possessed little of the exclusively Greek conservatism of Athens. Its cosmopolitanism was reflected in its religion, and among the various foreign cults which found a following among the denationalized Gentiles of the port the Jewish religion naturally held a place[27]. Moreover, the situation of the city made it a natural centre for the dissemination of the Gospel among the Jews of the province and the adjoining regions and their followers; in time it might be hoped that the new faith would permeate thence to regions even more remote[28]. In itself the size of the city rendered it a worthy object of attention; it was also the seat of the proconsular government and therefore Paul could hope to find in it a comparative immunity from persecution. Similar hopes had proved unfounded at Thessalonica; but Paul had only himself to blame for the indiscretion which had led to his expulsion from the capital of Macedonia. In future it would be easy for him to safeguard himself against the use of such language as that which had at Thessalonica exposed him to a suspicion of treason[29]. Moreover, the Jews of the city, in spite of their many adherents, were far from popular among their Gentile neighbours, and were not likely to run the risk of raising a serious riot against him, in view of the possibility that it might react unfavourably on themselves[30].

Hence it was difficult for Paul to adhere to his purpose of leaving the city without preaching the Gospel. He had had no such opening since he left the Syrian Antioch, and if he allowed it to slip, it might never recur. None the less he confined himself to introductory explanations of the Messianic promises, which could give no offence, until the arrival of Silas and Timothy. This should have been the signal for his departure. But they brought with them a further sum of money collected by the Christians at Philippi, which was sufficient, in view of the fact that he could support himself by working for Aquila and Priscilla, to free him from the financial embarrassment which had been one of the motives which had deterred him from attempting as yet to establish the Church at Corinth[31]. The effect

on Paul of this deliverance from at least one of his anxieties was to produce a sense of overwhelming spiritual compulsion to stay and preach in its fulness the Gospel at which as yet he had only hinted[32]. The result was as usual a violent outburst of opposition, which culminated in an open quarrel between Paul and the synagogue. After solemnly denouncing them for their rejection of the Gospel, Paul left the Jews[33], and proceeded to establish himself in the house of a certain Titius Justus, formerly a follower of Judaism, but converted to Christianity. This house adjoined the synagogue, a fact which rendered it suitable for Paul's purposes for two reasons. In the first place it made it easier to represent to the Gentile authorities that the Church was merely a variation of the old Jewish faith, and as such legally entitled to carry on its work in Corinth. In the second place it would naturally tend to divert many who had heard of Judaism and came to learn about it, but had not yet heard of the new development of Judaism, which Paul was preaching. At the same time the step was not one which the Jews could allow to pass unchallenged. The presence of a competitor next door to the synagogue could not be tolerated, unless the Jews were prepared to admit their defeat and lose their hope of gaining adherents among the Gentiles[34].

For a period the venture was successful, and the claim of the Church to be the true exponent of the Jewish faith received valuable support in the conversion of Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue. At the same time many Gentile converts were made. Paul soon foresaw the inevitable ending of his visit. The anger of the Jews was about to result in legal action for the suppression of the Church, which would probably be accompanied with a considerable degree of violence. The measures taken at Thessalonica by his opponents had been successful enough to make it impossible for him to revisit that city, and he had therefore been compelled to leave it to the supervision of his subordinates. Such a termination of his labours was obviously undesirable, since difficulties might easily arise in a new community, especially where, as was the case at Corinth, it was largely composed of Gentile converts, which could only be settled by a personal visit. Consequently the prudent course was to leave the city before any disturbance arose which might bring the faith into disrepute or result in a legal decision against it in the local or provincial courts. Paul accordingly made plans for departing from Corinth and so avoiding the risk of finding himself cut off from the possibility of returning on some future occasion. His caution was

however overruled by a vision which ordered him to remain there and preach without any fear of the consequences[35].

Meanwhile the Jews decided on a bold course of action. It had been undesirable, so long as the memories of the Roman disturbances were fresh in the memory of the local authorities and the proconsul of Achaea, to draw attention to the religious quarrels of the nation. But in the summer of A.D. 51 a new proconsul arrived[36]. This was Gallio, the brother of Seneca, a man of an amiable and easy-going temperament, who might be expected to uphold the Jews in defending the ancient form of their religion against Paul's innovations in order to save himself from the labour of inquiring into the theological issues involved. A decision in their favour would be a crowning victory. It could be urged by the Jews throughout the world as a precedent against Christianity, since the decision of a proconsul carried with it a weight which municipal officials would hardly ignore; even Imperial officers would in most cases accept it as a convenient method of saving themselves the trouble of a fresh inquiry. Further under a recent regulation of Claudius the expulsion of Paul from Achaea, which the Jews could not unreasonably hope to obtain, would carry with it exclusion from Rome and Italy. The advantage of such a result to the Jewish community at Rome was obvious, and the Jews expelled by the recent edict could hardly fail to impress it on the attention of their Corinthian brethren[37]. Thus the decision of a proconsul would be a very difficult obstacle for Paul to overcome, and would practically involve the exclusion of the Christian movement from any region in which the local Jewish colony had any influence, and therefore from any region in which Christianity could hope to make rapid progress.

The Jews, however, were disappointed. To the accompaniment of the usual scenes of violence, intended to intimidate the proconsul into giving a decision in their favour for the sake of avoiding a disturbance, they dragged Paul into court on a charge of making proselytes, not to the Jewish religion, but to a false version of it, which was contrary to the recognized Jewish Law, and therefore outside the protection accorded to the Jewish religion throughout the Empire. Gallio, however, had no intention of allowing himself to be drawn into the investigation of a subject so contemptible as the national superstition of the Jews and summarily dismissed the case without wearying himself by listening to Paul's reply to the charges of his accusers. His manifest contempt for them encouraged the Gentiles present to give vent to their anti-Semitic feelings by

beating the ruler of the synagogue in court, an action which the proconsul did not see fit to prevent[38]. The defeat of the Jews was complete, while Paul, although he had himself received an equal share of Gallio's contempt, had won a notable victory. He could always urge in his defence that the proconsul of Achaea had refused to take action against him, if any future charge were brought against him in local Gentile courts, and the defence would carry with it no little weight. For the present his position at Corinth was secured, and for a further period of nine months he continued his labours. His successes were for the most part won among the Gentiles of Corinth[39], though several of the leading Jewish residents were also persuaded to throw in their lot with the new interpretation of their ancient faith[40]. The new community displayed a remarkable aptitude for that spiritual enthusiasm, which was regarded by Paul as a pre-eminent mark of divine approval; the converts, however, were less successful in grasping the fact that the mere display of such supernatural endowments was of little value unless it was built on a solid foundation of Christian holiness. For the time being Paul's presence was sufficient to preserve his converts from any serious aberrations in this direction, and he did not realize the lack of foundation in the character of many of the Christians who were prominent in the Corinthian community. Their deficiencies were less noticeable owing to the presence of a number of converts expelled from Rome, who provided, so long as they remained at Corinth, an element of sobriety and stedfastness which many of the local converts lacked. In view of the wide diffusion of the spiritual gifts, which were held to carry with them a claim to authority in the Church of a directly divine origin, Paul may perhaps have considered it unnecessary to select from his converts any special rulers for conducting the worship of the community or governing them in his absence, supposing that the spiritual powers vouchsafed to certain individuals would provide all that was required[41]. In any case these regularly constituted rulers were overshadowed by those possessing peculiar spiritual gifts.

Meanwhile he was able from Corinth to keep in close touch with his Macedonian Churches[42]. Such communication was necessary since the shortness of the period of his actual residence at Thessalonica and the nature of the teaching he had given left openings for the most serious misunderstandings of its true import. If, as he had taught, the judgment of all men at the return of the Lord was imminent, his converts might easily fall into the view that it was unnecessary to take any consideration for their worldly concerns.

A general neglect of the duty of working for a living on the part of the Christian community was hardly likely to create a favourable impression as to its beliefs among the Gentile public; while on the other hand there was a danger that, in their excessive interest in speculations as to the date of the Second Coming and the circumstances that would attend it, the Christians might tend to neglect the moral duties which their profession involved[43]. His opponents at Thessalonica were able on two occasions to thwart his desire to return in person, by persuading the magistrates of the city to refuse to release Jason from his pledges, and consequently he was compelled to content himself with writing two letters to correct the misunderstandings which tended to creep into their conception of the Christian faith. At the same time the length of his stay in Corinth and the central position of the city enabled him to spread the Gospel, either in person or through his agents, to other parts of the province of Achaea[44].

By the spring of A.D. 52 the Corinthian Christians had reached a degree of stability, at least in outward appearance, which rendered it possible for Paul to leave them for the time to their own devices. The length of his absence from Syria and Judaea had exceeded his original intention by some eighteen months, and his return could no longer be delayed. At the same time the spiritual obstacle which had prevented him from preaching in Asia had been removed[45]. He could thus hope, after a visit to Palestine, to open a serious campaign at Ephesus. Apart from its natural advantages the city had now become necessary to him as a centre from which he could supervise his three widely-separated groups of Churches[46]; while it further possessed special qualifications for the important task which he had now to face, the organization among the Gentile communities of a collection for the benefit of the Mother-Church[47]. The task of preaching the Gospel in Asia was, however, too large to be undertaken until after a visit to Palestine, which Paul naturally desired to make at a time when it would enable him to unite with it the attendance at the great national festival of the Passover[48]. He could, however, pay a flying visit to Ephesus on his way home and prepare the ground for his future labours by some preliminary preaching in the synagogue. In order to remove any possible suspicion of his personal loyalty to the Jewish faith he undertook at Cenchreae before sailing the Nazirite vow, which he could only fulfil on his arrival in Jerusalem[49]. Having done this he sailed with his companions, the party being also joined by Aquila and Priscilla, for Ephesus, where he

spent a sabbath. In the synagogue he laid before the Jews those preliminary considerations as to the nature of the Messianic prophecies which would arouse the interest of his hearers without causing offence, and proceeded to Palestine[50]. Aquila and Priscilla remained behind to use any opening that might arise for preparing the way for his return.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI, SECTION V

1. For Thessalonica cf. *P.R.E.* I. 300, Hastings' *D.B.* IV. 749. The Jews are numerous enough to possess a synagogue (possibly they had more than one as the brevity of S. Paul's residence would hardly allow of his preaching at more than one, if there were several), while the success with which they intimidate the politarchs and later prevent S. Paul from returning (see below, n. 11) suggests a fairly numerous and influential settlement.

2. Thessalonica is the only provincial capital in which Paul is successfully attacked by the Jews, and it is probable that his haste in pressing on to Thessalonica without preaching at Amphipolis and Apollonia was due to the fact that he hoped to find in the capital of the province an immunity similar to that which he had enjoyed at the Syrian Antioch. It must be remembered that he had not originally intended to stop at Philippi (see above, § iii. n. 17). It would seem that the change of plans enforced on him had led him to see that the best policy was to avoid the smaller towns where he was always exposed to persecution and to evangelize only the cities where he could hope to settle for some time and to establish communities which would serve as centres for the rest of the world.

3. S. Paul appears throughout this part of his journey to be aiming at an early return to Palestine (see below, n. 13). This explains the fact that, according to the narrative of Acts, he alienates the Jews after three sabbaths in Thessalonica, whereas at Ephesus later he preaches for three months in the synagogue before his rupture with them (Acts xix. 8). It would seem that in his haste he put his views in their most aggressive form, without any preliminary attempt to conciliate Jewish feeling. Naturally he hoped to stay more than three weeks at Thessalonica; but he did not contemplate a prolonged stay there.

4. 1 Thess. i. 9 implies that the majority of the converts at Thessalonica were drawn from Gentiles, who were not yet proselytes. It must be remembered that the loosely attached adherents of the synagogues still observed the external forms of Gentile religion. Cf. *c. Apion.* ii. 39, Tert. *Ad Nat.* i. 13, Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 96 (where the father is content to observe the sabbath, while the son goes further and becomes a full proselyte). This explains the fact that although S. Paul can hardly have reached the Gentile population of Thessalonica, apart from those who attended the synagogue, he is none the less able to write to them as recent converts from heathenism.

5. The quite definite phrase *ἐπὶ τρία σάββατα* can scarcely mean anything but that the riot took place during the week which followed the third sabbath of S. Paul's mission in Thessalonica. This need not necessarily be the same as the third sabbath after his arrival in the city, since it is not certain that the ruler of the synagogue invited him to preach on the first sabbath after his arrival, though it would be natural for him to do so (§ i. n. 17). There is no necessary discrepancy between this and Phil. iv. 15. It would seem that the Philippians, fearing that S Paul would be in some financial difficulty owing to the haste of his departure, collected some money for him and sent it after him almost at once. The messengers found him working for his living (1 Thess. ii. 9), and reported the fact to the converts of Philippi on their return. It is by no means impossible that the Philippians, on hearing the news, should feel it their duty to make a fresh collection, rather than to allow S. Paul to be under the necessity of labouring for his living. There would be ample time for the journey, even if S. Paul's stay at Thessalonica

only lasted for just over a fortnight. It is also possible that the ruler of the synagogue did not ask him to preach on the first sabbath after his arrival, and that the words of Acts xvii. 2 relate to the duration of his preaching in the synagogue, not of his stay at Thessalonica.

It is necessary to realize that S. Paul did not regard any long preparation of his converts as necessary before their baptism, a fact which is clearly brought out in Acts xvi. 30 *seqq*. The brevity of the stay in Thessalonica explains S. Paul's anxiety as to the stedfastness of his converts (1 Thess. iii. 1) and his stay at Beroea (n. 11). Clearly, however, his teaching must have been very outspoken if it could in three weeks produce an organized community, mainly composed of Gentile converts (cf. also n. 43).

6. The rapidity of the Jewish reaction against S. Paul's teaching and the charge *οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες οὗτοι καὶ ἐνθάδε πάρεισιν* are quite inexplicable, if the only disturbances associated with the preaching of Christianity are those recorded by S. Luke. The disorderly proceedings at Philippi only affected the Gentile population, and there is no trace of any other disturbance nearer than the Pisidian Antioch. It is hardly likely that the Jews of Thessalonica had heard of the visit of S. Paul to those regions. On the other hand it is natural that they should have heard of the riots at Rome, since Thessalonica lay on the main road from Rome to the East (the *via Egnatia*) and the Jews of the city would have every facility for communicating with those of Rome. The riots there had been going on for some time, when Claudius issued his order for the expulsion of the Jews, and it is therefore probable that they were the reason for the violence of the Jewish opposition to S. Paul. It is of course possible that S. Paul himself did not hear of them until after his departure from Thessalonica; but in any case it seems clear that the language of the Jews implies that they were well acquainted with the difficulties produced by the preaching of Christianity at Rome. S. Luke's reasons for avoiding any more definite allusion to events at Rome are suggested above, § iv. n. 24.

7. The second and serious part of the charge brought by the Jews against S. Paul is remarkable. It is the charge which proved fatal to Our Lord (see c. 1. n. 18), but does not appear elsewhere in the N.T. It is noticeable that the charge harmonizes with the Thessalonian Epistles, which presuppose a strong emphasis in S. Paul's original teaching on the subject of the imminence of the Second Coming (1 Thess. ii. 16, iv. 13–v. 11, 2 i. 6–ii. 12). The general immunity of the Church from any charge of treason in the N.T. coincides with the tendency to abandon the use of the phrases *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, τῶν οὐρανῶν* etc. (see next note). The tendency to avoid the use of such phrases outside Palestine is natural, since in the Greek of the period *βασιλεύς* is commonly employed as the title of the reigning Emperor (cf. *Voc. Gr. Test. s.v.*). The usage is also found in Jewish literature, but it is comparatively uncommon. It occurs three times in the N.T. (1 Pet. ii. 13, 17, 1 Tim. ii. 2), and is found in Josephus (*B.J.* v. xiii. 6). That the usage was quite well known in Palestine is clear from the deliberately misleading use of the word in Jno. xix. 15. Generally, however, the N.T. writers use such words as *Σεβαστός* or *Καῖσαρ*, while Josephus prefers *αὐτοκράτωρ* or *ἡγεμών*, and Philo *αὐτοκράτωρ*. (Possibly in the case of Philo this is due to the fact that Egypt had been ruled by kings until the death of Cleopatra rather than to the Palestinian usage.) It seems reasonable to infer that the Apostles found it wiser not to use outside Palestine a phrase which opponents could use as a basis for a charge of treason; but that by a natural inadvertence at Thessalonica S. Paul made a somewhat indiscreet use of the word *βασιλεία* and that the charge of the Jews was based on its liability to misinterpretation.

8. The rarity of the phrases *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, τῶν οὐρανῶν* and the like outside the Gospels has often been noted. In the Acts there are eight instances of the use, but of these two occur in the section i. 1–12, which belongs to the Gospel rather than to the Acts. The remaining cases are all in editorial passages, not in the recorded speeches, with the exception of xx. 25. In the Pauline Epistles this use of *βασιλεία* occurs fourteen times, while God is twice referred to as King (cf. also 1 Cor. xv. 25). This comparative rarity of an idea which is one of the main notes of the Gospels is apparently due to the motive explained in the preceding note.

9. The action of the politarchs was directed against Jason, not against S. Paul himself, and consequently, since Thessalonica was a free city, there was no ground on which he could appeal to the proconsul as a Roman citizen. Thus the fact that Thessalonica was a provincial capital failed to provide him with any protection against their action.

10. The whole account of S. Paul's departure from Thessalonica is obscure. The charge brought against S. Paul was a very serious one, and it is stated to have disturbed the politarchs. On the other hand they are content to exact some kind of a bond from Jason and take no further measures in the matter. It is possible that Jason and his fellow-Christians escaped further punishment by pleading that they had no knowledge of any treasonable elements that might be contained in S. Paul's teaching, and that the hurried departure by night was necessary to avoid arrest. On the other hand it would be natural to suppose that the politarchs would be anxious to clear themselves from any suspicion of lack of zeal in such a matter and would take steps to warn the proconsul and the magistrates of neighbouring cities, such as Beroea, if they took the accusation as being in any way serious. Hence it seems on the whole most probable that the account given in the text is correct, and that the politarchs thought the charge too extravagant for serious consideration. In this case the language of Acts xvii. 8 is slightly inaccurate, in so far as it implies that the politarchs were alarmed at hearing the charge. S. Paul's hasty departure is to be ascribed to the excitement of the mob, rather than to any fear of arrest.

11. Although there was a synagogue at Beroea, it is unlikely that the Jewish residents were nearly as numerous as at Thessalonica in view of the comparative unimportance of the city, which was not even the administrative capital of its district of Macedonia. It lay off the main line of the *via Egnatia*, and some twenty miles from the sea, its only claim to consideration lying in the fact that it was the centre of a prosperous agricultural region. It lacked the importance of Amphipolis, which S. Paul passed through without preaching, and it is a remarkable proof of the extent of the Jewish Dispersion that there should be a synagogue here, with adherents among the better class of Gentile society. The motive for S. Paul's stay seems to be his desire to return to Thessalonica at the earliest opportunity. This is confirmed by the language of 1 Thess. ii. 18, according to which S. Paul desired on two occasions to revisit Thessalonica but found himself unable to do so. It would seem from the wording of this passage that these two occasions occurred before his arrival at Athens, *i.e.* during his residence at Beroea. This need not imply a long residence at Beroea, which was only some fifty miles from Thessalonica. In this case "Satan" represents the unbelieving Jews. S. Paul would hardly dignify by this title the bond exacted from Jason by the politarchs, and it is difficult to see how such a bond could prevent him from returning. Jason could hardly suffer if S. Paul returned to Thessalonica, unless his return resulted in renewed disorders. On the other hand S. Paul might reasonably hope to be able to escape the vigilance of his Jewish opponents and revisit Thessalonica quietly, as he had done elsewhere (§ i. n. 36). The Jews, however, exercised an unwonted vigilance and the attempt had to be abandoned. This explains S. Paul's indignation with his fellow-countrymen in 1 Thess. ii. 14 and his identification of them with Satan. S. Paul is quite capable of seeing in the unbelieving Jews the activities of Satan—he applies it to his Christian opponents in 2 Cor. xi. 14—but he would hardly so describe the magistrates of Thessalonica.

In itself it is improbable that S. Paul would attempt any serious missionary work at Beroea, unless he had other reasons for waiting there. The place was unimportant, and it will be seen that in fact S. Paul did not intend to preach at Athens or Corinth. It was useful as a place of refuge, so long as he could hope to return to Thessalonica in a few weeks' time, especially as Timothy could, if necessary, be used as a messenger; it seems that he was able to go back, when S. Paul could not, presumably for the reason that he had not preached and was not likely to be recognized. It would seem from Acts xvii. 11 that S. Paul accommodated his teaching to the circumstances; the allusion to the Scriptures and the fact that the majority of the converts were Jews suggest that he used his most conciliatory style, and did not press too vigorously those parts of his teaching which were certain to excite opposition; the difficulties that lead to his departure are due to the

Jews of Thessalonica. It is possible that the news of the rioting at Rome did not reach Beroea as early as Thessalonica. The town lay off the main line of the *via Egnatia*, and it would seem, from the fact that S. Paul could stay there for a few weeks before the Jews of Thessalonica heard of his presence there, that communications between the two cities were not very good.

12. 1 Thess. iii. 2.

13. The apparent discrepancy between the narrative of the Acts as to the movements of S. Paul and his companions at this point and the events implied in 1 Thess. iii. 1 have given rise to many speculations. The difficulties, however, only arise from a failure to grasp the fact that S. Luke here, as elsewhere, is entirely uninterested in the activities of his characters, when they are not on the centre of the stage (cf. c. v. § iii. n. 2). According to S. Luke S. Paul leaves his two companions at Beroea and proceeds to Athens. Instead of waiting for them there he goes on to Corinth, where they rejoin him. On the other hand, from 1 Thess. iii. 1 it seems that S. Paul was rejoined in Athens by Timothy, whom he sent back to Thessalonica to inquire as to the state of the local Christians. Timothy returned with a favourable report and rejoined S. Paul at Corinth. The movements of Silas are not so clear. It would be natural to interpret 1 Thess. iii. 1 as meaning that SS. Paul and Silas were at Athens together and agreed to send Timothy to Thessalonica, though it is not quite certain whether it is possible to press the use of the first person plural to this extent. S. Paul uses it throughout this Epistle without making any clear distinction between it and the first person singular; in fact there is so little difference that in ii. 18, when he wishes to distinguish between himself and his colleague, he has to make his meaning clear by the introduction of ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος. Consequently it is quite probable that Silas remained throughout in Macedonia and did not rejoin S. Paul until after his arrival at Corinth. On the other hand it is also quite possible that Silas went to Athens with Timothy. This, however, does not prove that S. Luke is wrong in making him rejoin S. Paul at Corinth, since it is perfectly possible that he went back from Athens to Beroea or Philippi, after Timothy's mission to Thessalonica, and then returned from Macedonia to Corinth. S. Luke's omission of such minor movements cannot be taken to reflect on his accuracy, for the simple reason that he regards them as too unimportant to mention.

On the other hand the fact that he notes the temporary separation of the various members of the party in Acts xvii. 14, his allusion to S. Paul's waiting for them in *v.* 16, and his account of S. Paul's activities before and after the reunion in xviii. 3–5 are of the utmost importance. S. Paul ordered his companions to rejoin him as soon as possible and went to Athens to wait for them. While doing so he was "provoked" by the idolatry of the city. The result was that he started preaching, apparently in a tentative manner (see below, nn. 25, 50), breaking off his work as soon as he found that he was gaining a prominence, which for some reason he did not desire, in spite of the complete absence of evidence of any persecution. Similarly at Corinth while waiting for his companions he preaches in a conciliatory manner with some success, until they join him, whereupon he is "constrained by the word" and adopts a new style of speech, which leads to an immediate rupture with the Jews. Thus in both cases he is originally only concerned to use the time of waiting in quiet work which does not evoke opposition, while at Athens he departs rather than commit himself to serious work, and at Corinth only starts a wider campaign under the influence of some kind of sense that he is constrained to do so. The only interpretation of S. Luke's language, especially in view of the fact that the movements of Silas and Timothy are recorded with such detail, and yet inaccurately, is that the foundation of the Churches of Achaea was no part of S. Paul's original intention. Since he had not originally meant to visit Macedonia, it is natural that he should shrink from a still further extension of his field of action (cf. § iii. n. 15). Further it appears from Acts xvii. 15 that he was anxious that the necessary delay involved by his separation from his companions should be as brief as possible.

Thus it appears that S. Luke is anxious to emphasize the fact that S. Paul's action in founding the Churches of Achaea was not part of any deliberate plan, but was contrary to his wishes. The probable reason for the emphasis which he lays on the fact is the doubts cast by S. Paul's opponents on his authority for

travelling so far afield without any sort of consent from the rest of the Church (see § iii. n. 5, and c. VII. § iii. n. 22). S. Paul himself is not likely to have been very much influenced by fear of opposition on these grounds, since he pays very little regard to the authority of others as compared with the possibility of preaching the Gospel. On the other hand a further campaign in Achaea would increase his responsibilities very seriously. A visitation of his "diocese" involved already the journey from the Syrian Antioch through Cilicia and Galatia to Troas and thence to Macedonia, and a fresh mission would saddle him with the necessity of visiting Corinth as well. It would seem, however, that he had the further reasons for anxiety suggested in the text. It might well be dangerous to leave the Hebrew Christians alone for too long, since they were likely to resent their defeat and might well devise some fresh means for undermining his influence in Syria in the hopes of securing a reversal of the decision of the Council. His journey up to this point had occupied almost the whole of the travelling season, and a delay at Corinth would involve him in remaining there throughout the winter, a delay which he would naturally desire to avoid. There is indeed no direct evidence that he was anxious to return for this reason, but the conjecture is natural, and it is difficult to suppose that S. Paul failed to realize the probability of Jewish opposition as a result of his victory at Jerusalem. (For the time of his arrival at Corinth see n. 36.)

That he was to some extent influenced by anxiety as to his funds is also probable. Although he seems to have avoided accepting the support of his converts where possible, we do not hear of his working until he reaches Thessalonica (1 Thess. ii. 9), where he also receives support from the Philippians (Phil. iv. 15). At Philippi he had accepted the hospitality of Lydia, but against his will (Acts xvi. 15). At Corinth he supported himself in part by his labours, but also received support from Macedonia (2 Cor. xi. 9). The use of *ὑστέρημα* here suggests a considerable need of such assistance. It is to be remembered that S. Paul's journey had involved far more travelling than he had originally intended, and therefore more expense, while it also had taken him in quite a different direction from that contemplated when he left Syria. Thus if he had made arrangements for obtaining credit at Ephesus, his original destination, he might well find himself short of funds by the time he left Philippi. Although he could easily earn enough to support himself, he could hardly make enough out of his trade of tent-making to enable him to pay his passage from Corinth to Palestine as well. Probably the money brought from Macedonia by the brethren referred to in 2 Cor. xi. 9 was a sum collected by Silas and Timothy from the Christians of Philippi to enable him to return home, and was kept for that purpose, unless indeed S. Paul made arrangements when at Corinth to enable him to obtain funds in the city. We do not know enough of his financial position to say how far he was able to do so, but in view of the length of his stay at Corinth it would have been easy for him to send back to Antioch to make arrangements for obtaining funds from the Church there, or draw on any private means which he may have possessed.

14. The use of the word *ἐξαποστέλλω* in Acts xvii. 14 is curious. Elsewhere S. Luke uses the word in its formal sense of "commission" (c. IV. § i. n. 63). Here it is hard to find any such meaning for it, unless we are to suppose that S. Luke is anxious to ascribe S. Paul's extension of his journey from Macedonia to Achaea to a direct commission from the Church at Beroea, and so to forestall the criticisms of those who objected to his whole method of procedure. This, however, is unlikely, since such critics would not be very much impressed by the argument. A handful of Beroean converts had no authority to commission S. Paul in such a matter. Probably he uses it simply as a variation from the two more obvious words *ἀπολύω* and *ἐκπέμπω*, which he has just used in *vv.* 9 and 10. (For *ἀπολύω* in the sense of *ἐκπέμπω* cf. Acts xiii. 3.)

15. The inscriptions prove the existence of Jewish and Samaritan synagogues at Athens (*G.J.V.* III. 56). The number indeed is surprising, since Athens never recovered its importance as a commercial centre under the Empire. Its position was due to its literary associations, in virtue of which it became the educational centre of the civilized world. For this reason it attracted a large number of visitors, some merely tourists, others students of philosophy. The presence of such persons might well attract a certain number of Jewish traders. It is also by no means

improbable that a certain number of Jews were to be found among such visitors. Rabbinical Judaism forbad Jews to study under Gentile teachers, but this prohibition was of later date, as is clear from Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 1. It is probable that the Jews consisted of these two classes and a certain number of ordinary traders at the port. S. Luke mentions Gentile adherents of the synagogue, but it may perhaps be doubted whether they were drawn from the cultured classes. The port no doubt provided a number of denationalized slaves and freedmen, who were likely to be attracted to an essentially barbarous religion more easily than their betters. The visitors to Athens also were of very mixed origin, being drawn from all parts of the Greek world, and would include many whose claim to Greek extraction was more than doubtful; but it is probable that such visitors would follow the lead of the Athenians in their scorn for anything of barbarian origin. There was probably a good deal of truth in the taunt of Piso recorded by Tacitus (*Ann.* ii. 55), *Non Athenienses, sed colluviem illam nationum*; but the more educated immigrants would probably be more Athenian than the Athenians in their dislike of Judaism.

16. For a general description of Athens at this period cf. Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of S. Paul*, pp. 266 *seqq.* The story of S. Paul's visit may be compared with the account of the visit of Apollonius of Tyana, as recorded by Philostratus (iv. 17 *seqq.*), which reveals the same interest in hearing a new philosopher, and the same absorption in the details of religion. The piety of the Athenians is also illustrated in Lucian's account of the life of Demonax (§ 11). A public of this type was hardly likely to welcome either Judaism or Christianity. Further the attachment to the past led to a general opposition to new Oriental cults as being of a barbarous origin; for instance, the traces of the cult of Mithras are very rare in Greece proper, none being found at Athens. (For Lucian's opinion of the cult of Mithras cf. *Deor. Conc.* 9.) The contemptuous rejection of S. Paul by the Athenian philosophers was the beginning of a hostility which lasted until the fourth century, when Athens was the last bulwark of the old religion against the Church. The comparative obscurity of the Athenian Church shows how small a hold Christianity was able to obtain over the natives of the city (see *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.* 1. 3048). The opposition of Athens to the Church, as evinced by the formula of the Eleusinian mysteries εἴ τις ἄθεος ἢ χριστιανὸς ἢ ἐπικούρειος ἥκει κατάσκοπος τῶν ὀργίων φευγέτω (Lucian, *Alexander* 38), would have been no less vigorous as against Judaism.

It is probable that the majority of S. Paul's converts were Jews and their adherents of the poorer class. S. Luke mentions one or two who had a rather better position; but it may be doubted whether there were any others.

17. Acts xvii. 17.

18. Cf. n. 13 above.

19. For S. Paul's speech at Athens cf. c. iv. § i. n. 16; to the references there given may be added *c. Apion.* ii. 22 and the Sibylline fragment quoted by Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* ii. 36, which formed the original prelude to book iii of the present collection. It is entirely in harmony with the conception of Judaism prevalent among well-informed Gentile inquirers, cf. Hecataeus, quoted by Diodorus xl. iii. 4 and Strabo xvi. ii. p. 760 (Strabo is somewhat less accurate than Hecataeus). From the prevalence of a fairly accurate idea of Judaism stated in terms acceptable to Greek philosophy, it is clear that there were plenty of Jews who could present it in such a light, and it is therefore unnecessary to look in this passage for any proof that S. Paul had made any independent study of Greek thought. Its only remarkable feature is the statement that God has overlooked the sin involved in the past idolatry of the Gentiles—a natural consequence of S. Paul's theology in view of the fact that he is at the moment offering salvation to idolaters, but entirely contrary to the ordinary Jewish view, which he follows himself in Ro. i. 22 *seqq.* (cf. iv. § i. Appendix I).

20. S. Paul's teaching in the synagogue is ascribed to his provocation by the idolatry of Athens. It may be presumed, since we hear nothing of a breach with the synagogue, that he avoided the controversial side of his teaching.

21. For a summary of the various conjectures as to the nature of this request or demand that S. Paul should speak, and whether he spoke before the Council of the Areopagus, either in a judicial or academic capacity, or on the Areopagus

as a convenient place for a quiet discussion, cf. Leclercq in *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.* I. 3040. Although it is hazardous to add to the list, I should be inclined to put forward the suggestion that S. Luke knew of the Areopagus as the oldest and most venerable Athenian tribunal, and of the conversion of one of its members as the result of a speech uttered in a gathering of Athenian philosophers. From this information he inferred a speech before the Areopagus, but had no means of verifying his inference. This explains the vagueness of his narrative, which leaves it uncertain whether S. Paul is appearing before some kind of a tribunal or expounding his teaching to a group of philosophers, and the inconclusive ending of the story in *v.* 33. But the conjecture is decidedly temerarious.

22. For altars to "Unknown Gods" at Athens cf. Philostratus, *De Vit. Apoll. Tyanensis*, vi. 3 and Pausanias, *Descr. Graeciae*, I. i. 4. Leclercq, *loc. cit.*, suggests that the altar was in fact dedicated to Amen, "the Unknown God" of Egypt, the Zeus Ammon of Greek mythology, and also that S. Paul was influenced by the Jewish avoidance of the "tetragrammaton" out of reverence for the Name of God. (For this conception in Hellenistic Judaism cf. *Or. Sib.* iii. 18.)

23. Cf. n. 13.

24. See above, § iv, n. 24.

25. Note the clear distinction implied between the tentative discussions of Acts xviii. 4 and the testimony, uttered under overpowering spiritual pressure in *v.* 5 after the arrival of Silas and Timothy, and cf. below, n. 50, for evidence as to the two styles of language employed by S. Paul at Ephesus on the occasion of his first and second visit respectively. The change of style is definitely represented by S. Luke as coinciding with the arrival of Silas and Timothy, while the adoption of the bolder style is ascribed to forces beyond S. Paul's control (see n. 32 below).

26. Corinth at this period was of course the colony founded by Julius Caesar in 46 B.C. on the site of the old city destroyed by Mummius a century before. The colonists are said to have been very largely freedmen (Strabo VIII. vi. 23) and it is unlikely that they had by this time any very noticeable Roman characteristics. For a description see the account by Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* I. 479 *seqq.*, and the Introduction to Goudge's edition of 1 Cor. in the Westminster series.

27. Cf. Apuleius, *Metam.* xi. 11 *seqq.*, for the Egyptian mysteries at Cenchreae; though the Egyptian mysteries were popular throughout Greece, and in this respect on a different footing from the later Oriental cults, it is hardly likely that any Greek city but Corinth could have provided on a similar scale the spectacle described by Apuleius. Corinth again was the first Greek city to introduce gladiatorial games, and there is no trace of the opposition to them which was manifested at Athens (cf. Lucian, *Demonax* 57). Their popularity is, however, to be regarded as a sign of the similarity of Corinth to the other cosmopolitan centres of the eastern Mediterranean than as evidence of any survival of the Roman character (cf. *P.R.E.* I. 280 and Dill, *Roman Society*, p. 240). It should be noted that there is no evidence that the temple of Aphrodite with its notorious system of temple-prostitutes, which is frequently referred to in accounts of S. Paul's work at Corinth, was restored after the destruction of the original city, and there seems no room for it in Pausanias' description of Corinth.

Judaism naturally found a good opening at Corinth (cf. Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 1). We have no direct evidence of the existence of more than one synagogue, but see below, n. 34. Even if there was only one it would appear from Acts xviii. 4 and 8 that it had a considerable Gentile following. The language of *v.* 15 also suggests that the Jews have a more or less recognized court of their own to deal with offences against the Law. Such courts are known to have existed at Alexandria (Strabo, *ap. Antt.* XIV. vii. 2) and Sardis (*Antt.* XIV. x. 17), and probably were to be found at other large centres of the Dispersion, but can hardly be assumed to have been universal. The unpopularity of the Jews evinced in *v.* 17 and the fact that the ruler of the synagogue is a well-known and easily-recognized person also indicate a Jewish colony of a considerable size. The history of the Corinthian Church supports this view. Although in its composition it was largely Gentile it originates in the synagogue, and owes its success in no small measure to the fact that S. Paul, representing it as the true synagogue, carries on his mission in a house adjoining it.

28. For the existence of Jewish settlements in the islands of the Aegean, which would naturally be reached from Corinth, cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 36 (M. II. 587), *Antt.* XIV. x. 8 (Paros and Delos, for the latter cf. also § 14), 15 (Cos), and cf. vii. 2. *G.J.V.* III. 55 gives an exhaustive list, but it should be noted that the circular letter of 1 Macc. xv. 23 cannot be taken as a necessary proof of the existence of Jews in the places referred to.

29. It is to be supposed that S. Paul was wise enough to avoid dangerous phrases. Even Gallio could hardly have avoided a serious inquiry into a charge of *majestas*, though he might have decided that the charge was frivolous after hearing it, as apparently did the politarchs at Thessalonica (see n. 10 above).

30. For the reasons which lead the Jews to appeal to Gallio rather than to the magistrates of Corinth see below, n. 37.

31. This is possibly to be inferred from 2 Cor. xi. 9, but it is equally possible that the assistance came at a later period of his residence at Corinth, and that his decision to preach was unconnected with his relief at being freed from financial embarrassments.

32. For the use of the word *συνέχομαι* in this sense cf. Lk. xii. 50, 2 Cor. v. 14, Phil. i. 23.

33. Cf. § i. n. 24. It is possible that S. Luke simply records the solemn turning to the Gentiles here to emphasize the fact that Corinth is in a certain sense a turning-point, marking the end of S. Paul's labours as an itinerant missionary. Henceforth he settles down to lengthy periods of work in large centres. He had intended to do so at Thessalonica, but without success.

34. Cf. § i. n. 26. The mere fact of the proximity of the new "synagogue" to the old would suggest that it was a continuation of the old system of Judaism. The suggestion would be strengthened if the new synagogue lay like the old in a regular Jewish quarter. Such quarters existed at Rome (Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 23 (M. II. 568)) and Alexandria (Philo, *In Flaccum* 8 (M. II. 525), *Antt.* XIV. vii. 2, quoted from Strabo). There is no evidence that this was so at Corinth, but the tendencies which lead to the formation of Jewish quarters were no less operative in S. Paul's time than at present. For a fragmentary inscription which seems to have formed the lintel of a synagogue at Corinth, cf. *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.* III. 2960. It may be noted that the title is *συναγωγὴ Ἑβρεῶν*. There is a synagogue of the same name at Rome, which was apparently so called as being the synagogue mainly frequented by native Hebrews, as opposed to those born in the Dispersion. It is possible that the Corinthian inscription should be interpreted as referring to a synagogue of a similar character, in which case it would imply the existence of at least one other synagogue in Corinth for the use of Hellenists. This would explain the roughness of the inscription, which seems to indicate that the resources of the synagogue were smaller than we should expect in a city of the size of Corinth (*Dict. d'Arch. Chrét. loc. cit.*). Obviously the resources of a synagogue of native Hebrews would be small. The use of the name would be natural, since it would enable the adherents of Judaism to recognize such a synagogue as one where worship would be conducted in Aramaic and not in Greek (cf. c. II. n. 2).

It might indeed be objected that the inscription over the door of a synagogue of this character would probably be in Aramaic, whereas the inscription is in fact in Greek. The objection is, however, not conclusive, since the inscriptions on the graves of members of the synagogue of the Hebrews in Rome are in Greek (*G.J.V.* III. 83 *n*).

The use of the word *Ἑβραῖος* to denote native-born Jews rather than Jews in general is certainly more in accordance with the ordinary Hellenistic practice, and the inscription tends on the whole to confirm the supposition that there were several synagogues, or at least two, in Corinth.

35. The vision is introduced between the usual summary of S. Paul's labours and the equally usual account of the persecution which terminates them. Hitherto he has, when possible, withdrawn from any city he visits before the persecution has had time to develop into measures of actual violence. Thus he succeeds in withdrawing at Antioch and Iconium, as well as at Beroea. At Lystra, Philippi and Thessalonica he is surprised before he has time to escape. Here the vision is similar to that described in Acts xxii. 17, which occurs when S. Paul is in doubt

whether to leave Jerusalem before the plots of the Hellenists have time to develop (cf. c. IV. § i. n. 62). Psychologically it is the solution, in the form of an external apparition, of S. Paul's own doubts whether to leave Corinth or to face the persecution of the Jews.

36. The date of the proconsulate of Gallio is fixed by the Delphic inscription published in 1905. (A reproduction of this with a restoration of the missing parts is given in *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.* III. 2960.) The inscription is a letter from Claudius to the city of Delphi, written at the time when Claudius had been saluted *Imperator* for the twenty-sixth time, and alludes to some information conveyed to him by Gallio as proconsul. Now the twenty-seventh salutation of Claudius falls before Aug. 1 of A.D. 52, the date on which the *Aqua Claudia* was dedicated, since the dedication of this monument mentions the twenty-seventh salutation. Gallio's year of office would normally start at the beginning of July, and since the twenty-seventh salutation is earlier than Aug. 1 of A.D. 52, while Gallio as proconsul has already written to Claudius, it is hardly likely that his year of office could be the year July 52–July 53. On the other hand the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth salutations of Claudius both fall at some time in the years A.D. 51 and 52, and before August of the latter year. In the former year, however, we have no record of any military successes, whereas in the latter fall the victory of Ostorius Scapula over the Silures in Britain and a victory over the Cilician mountain tribes. Hence it seems reasonable to suppose that these two salutations fell in the earlier months of A.D. 52, and that Gallio's letter was written during this period. Hence his term of office would run from July A.D. 51 to July A.D. 52.

There is less certainty as to the relation of the date of the attack by the Jews on S. Paul both to the proconsulate of Gallio and to the mission to Corinth. As regards the former point, however, it is probable that the Jews would see their best opportunity for an attack on S. Paul at a time when Gallio was new to the province. Now the facts that S. Paul stays at Corinth for eighteen months, that when he departs he is in such haste that he can only spend a single sabbath at Ephesus in spite of pressure to remain, and that he has undertaken a vow which would naturally be fulfilled at the Passover or Pentecost (n. 49), all suggest very strongly that the eighteen months extend from the close of one travelling season to the beginning of the next but one. The wording of Acts xviii. 11, 12, cannot be pressed to mean that the accusation before Gallio falls at the end of the eighteen months. The length of S. Paul's residence is stated by way of an appendix to the vision, before the narrative proceeds to describe the attack of the Jews. (For the practice of S. Luke in anticipating the order of events in this way cf. above, c. v. § iii. n. 14.) The Jews would hardly have much prospect of success if they delayed their attack for so long a time as eighteen months.

Thus it seems most probable that S. Paul's arrival in Corinth falls late in A.D. 50, and his breach with the Jews fairly early in A.D. 51. The accusation before Gallio would seem to come in July of the same year. It would no doubt have been made earlier, but for the fact that the Jews were under a cloud on account of the disturbances at Rome in A.D. 50. These brought the Jews into disrepute and it would be natural that they should wait for a new proconsul, who would not have been holding any office at the time when they occurred.

37. For the value of a proconsular decision cf. Ramsay, *S. Paul the Traveller*, p. 259. It is, however, remarkable that the Jews should appeal to Gallio at all, rather than to the local magistrates, who elsewhere usually appear inclined to support them against the Christians. They would in general be more open to influence than the provincial governors of higher rank. It is indeed possible that the local magistrates were known at Corinth to be hostile to the Jews, in the same way as the mob appears to have been, but to judge by S. Paul's previous experiences, it was probable that they would avoid the risk of a disturbance by ordering S. Paul to leave the city, without troubling themselves to hold an inquiry. On the other hand in appealing to Gallio the Jews were taking a serious risk of defeat. Gallio might refuse to hear the case at all, as in fact he did, or might decide in S. Paul's favour. Either result would be a set-back for his opponents, since it would leave S. Paul free to preach, and also able to plead a proconsular decision in his favour. No local magistrates of Corinth could reverse this, whereas an unfavourable decision

by the magistrates of one year might always be reversed by those of the next. A subsequent proconsul might reverse the decision of his predecessor, but was hardly likely to do so at the request of the Jews. Moreover, a decision in S. Paul's favour would carry weight in other regions. Hence it is remarkable that the Jews of Corinth should take the risk which an appeal to Gallio involved.

It seems likely that the explanation is to be found in the measure of Claudius mentioned by Suetonius (*Claud.* 23), (*Sanxit ut*) *ii quibus a magistratibus provinciae interdicerentur, urbe quoque et Italia summoverentur*. It must be remembered that the Jews of Corinth, apart from the ease with which they could communicate with their brethren in Rome, had probably been reinforced by some of the leading Roman Jews expelled from the capital by Claudius. Naturally such temporary residents would urge on their brethren at Corinth the desirability of taking steps to prevent S. Paul from following other Christian teachers in visiting Rome and possibly perverting large numbers of the Jews in that city. Although S. Paul might venture to visit Rome in face of an adverse decision, yet it would be easy for the Jews there to attack him for disobeying it, and thus to secure his punishment without raising the question of his religious views at all. Unfortunately Suetonius does not give the date of the edict and therefore it can only be conjectured that the motive for their action was that given in the text. The edict may not have been issued at the time of the attack on S. Paul.

38. Acts xviii. 12 does not necessarily imply violence, but the development in *v.* 17 is hardly intelligible, if the Jews merely brought an orderly accusation. Even if Gallio refused to hear it, he would hardly "drive" them away, or allow the assault on Sosthenes, unless the Jews were responsible for the beginning of the disorder.

Ramsay's suggestion that there had been careful preliminary inquiries (*S. Paul the Traveller*, p. 258) is hardly probable. Naturally Gallio would learn the nature of the charge from the spokesman of the Jews, who would introduce the accusation in a speech similar to that of Tertullus in Acts xxiv. 2. From this Gallio would learn as much as he wanted to know.

The charge itself is that S. Paul, while using the advantages accorded to the Jews by the Roman government, is in fact teaching a false version of Judaism. "The Law" in *v.* 13 is certainly the Jewish Law. The word *νόμος* in the N.T. is invariably used in reference to the Jewish Law, except where it is deliberately used, as in Ro. viii. 2, of Christianity as the "New Law" in contrast to the old Jewish Law. It is never used of Gentile laws. It seems clear that Gallio, having listened to the preliminary speech on behalf of the Jews, was quite satisfied that the matter related solely to the correct interpretation of Judaism and therefore refused to deal with it as being too contemptible for his notice and perhaps as falling within the jurisdiction of the Jews themselves.

39. The predominantly Gentile character of the Corinthian community appears in the failings of the Corinthians, as shown in the Epistles (see below, c. VII. § iii. nn. 4, 5, 6). The appearance among them of a certain number of Latin names (Crispus, Lucius, Tertius, Gaius, Quartus, etc.) is probably a pure coincidence, and not specially to be attributed to the fact that Corinth was a colony. Crispus was a Jew. Gaius was a common *praenomen* in the Imperial family and therefore common throughout the Empire, especially among the Jews of the Dispersion, who were warm supporters of the Empire. It is natural that the number of Latin names should increase in communities nearer to Rome, but it would be entirely unsafe to assume that their bearers were of Roman descent. It is likely that some of these bearers of Roman names were, like Aquila, refugees from Rome, either Jews or proselytes, expelled by the edict of Claudius. The mixture of nationalities at Corinth was probably as great as in any Christian community.

40. Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, must have been a Jew of some standing, as must Sosthenes, if the bearer of the name in 1 Cor. i. 1 is the same person as the Sosthenes of Acts xviii. 17. It is probable that this is the case, since the Sosthenes who joins in writing the letter to the Corinthians is clearly a Christian of note. It is therefore likely that he had been a Jew of some standing before his conversion, while it is also probable that he was a Corinthian, since he joins in writing this letter, but does not appear elsewhere in Pauline literature. But neither reason is sufficient to make the identification more than conjectural.

41. The evidence of the Corinthian Epistles may perhaps indicate that at the time when they were written there was no system of government at Corinth similar to that existing in other Pauline communities. In the place of the rulers and teachers who meet us elsewhere (§ i. n. 38), we find apparently in 1 Cor. xii. 8 a "charismatic" ministry; while the absence of any allusion to constituted rulers of any kind in a letter dealing with practical disorders seems remarkable, if in fact any such rulers had been appointed. It is indeed clear that there were at a later period rulers at Corinth who derived their authority from the Apostles, presumably from S. Paul (1 Clem. xlii *seqq.*), but it is only natural to suppose that if he had in the first instance left the Corinthian community in charge of a "charismatic" ministry he would in view of its results substitute for it a more regular form of government before the end of his last stay at Corinth. Hence there is no reason for supposing that the presbyters referred to by S. Clement date from the first foundation of the Corinthian community.

On the other hand it is unsafe to base too much emphasis on the silence of the Corinthian Epistles or even on the appearance of a "charismatic" ministry as evidence of S. Paul's original arrangements for the government of the Church of Corinth. It is possible that he had originally established presbyters, but that at the time of the writing of the Epistles they had ceased to be an effective force to which he could appeal. Presbyters would naturally be chosen from among the steadier and more reliable converts, especially from those who were of Jewish origin or proselytes of long standing. Now at Corinth S. Paul could draw not only on the local converts, but also on those who had been expelled from Rome and were residing at Corinth. We have no direct evidence of the existence of such converts apart from Aquila and his wife; but the sudden lapse of the Corinthians into the state presupposed in 1 Cor. is very difficult to explain, unless there had been, for some reason, a serious depletion of the number of reliable converts. Such a depletion might be the result of persecution; but there is no evidence of persecution at Corinth. Further the number of personal friends to whom S. Paul sends his greetings in Ro. xvi is inexplicable, unless we realize that it is highly probable that Aquila and Priscilla were not the only refugees from Rome to be found at Corinth on S. Paul's arrival; in point of fact it would be only natural that there should be a considerable number in the city. It is also natural that they should have drifted back to Rome as soon as they could do so safely, and that S. Paul should send them his greetings in writing (see further, c. VIII. § i. n. 24). This may have led to a depletion of the number of reliable converts and so contributed to the collapse of the Church at Corinth. In the second place it is only natural that some at least of the leading Jewish converts should have joined the party of Cephas and so been useless as persons to whom S. Paul could appeal in support of his authority (cf. c. VII. § iii. n. 10). Thus it is possible that there were originally presbyters, but that S. Paul does not appeal to them, for the simple reason that some have left and others gone over to the side of his opponents. In this case it is to be supposed that the "charismatic" ministry represents an accessory ministry, which has grown up at Corinth as a result of the wide diffusion of spiritual gifts. S. Paul does not criticize it, possibly for the reason that he does not feel strong enough to do so at the moment, but more probably for the reason that he regards it as being in itself an excellent thing.

In support of the view that it is unlikely that S. Paul would have left the Corinthian Church to the care of ministers whose sole claim to authority was their proficiency in the display of spiritual gifts, it may be noticed that in 1 Cor. iii. 1 he writes as though he had no very great occasion to be satisfied with their spiritual development when he first left Corinth. It is, however, unsafe to press this point, since S. Paul is mainly concerned in this passage to lessen the self-satisfaction of his readers, and is quite capable of over-stating the extent to which he realized their defects at the time. It is in any case necessary to observe that he seems to have devoted his energies almost entirely in preaching to the unconverted (1 i. 17), and to have baptized converts with very little preparatory instruction (cf. n. 5). Nor does he seem to have paid much attention to the instruction of those baptized, since the Corinthians are liable to error on points which we should naturally regard as being of primary importance. Hence it is quite possible that he did not in fact appoint presbyters at Corinth on the occasion of his first visit, and supposed that

the spiritual gifts which were manifested by the Corinthians were sufficient to provide all that was needed for the government of the community. It would be easier for him to be misled as to the spiritual development of his converts, since his presence would be sufficient to avert the danger of scandals such as those which occurred after his departure.

Thus on the whole the evidence of the Epistles seems to favour the view that S. Paul from the outset was misled by the spiritual gifts of the Corinthians, and entrusted the community to the charge of those peculiarly gifted in this direction. In this case it is easier to understand the competition for opportunities of displaying them which led to the scandals of 1 Cor. xiv. 26. The result of the experiment was clearly a disastrous one, though no doubt this might have been different had his original converts from Rome remained at Corinth. In any case the evidence on the point cannot be regarded as conclusive in either direction.

(If the conjecture that S. Paul's original converts at Corinth were kept from displaying their lack of sobriety by the presence of Roman refugees with a more balanced outlook be accepted, it is to be remembered that their superior reliability is attributable to the fact that they would in most cases be Jews or proselytes, and not to any Roman quality. Few, if any, would be of Roman origin.)

42. It is immaterial for the present purpose whether 2 Thessalonians is genuine or not. The main objection is based on the peculiar passage ii. 1–12, but this is ill-founded (cf. c. v. § iii. n. 9). Both letters harmonize with the view of the Jewish accusation advanced in n. 7, since they clearly presuppose that S. Paul's teaching on the subject of the Second Coming has been open to misunderstanding. This might well be the case seeing how short his mission was, and how suddenly it had been cut short. The difficulty is to harmonize with the narrative of S. Luke the language of S. Paul in 1 Thess. i. 7. The letter was clearly written shortly after Timothy had rejoined S. Paul at Corinth (1 Thess. iii. 6), and it is to be supposed that Timothy's mission to Thessalonica was not a very long one (Acts xvii. 16, cf. 1 Thess. iii. 1). It is unlikely that S. Paul was long at Beroea, since apart from the reasons suggested in the present narrative, he would probably not be left in peace for long by the Jews of Thessalonica. Thus it is hard to explain S. Paul's statement that the faith of the Thessalonians has become famous not only in Macedonia and Achaea, but everywhere else. The only known places in which any interest in the matter would be taken falling outside Macedonia and Achaea are Rome, Galatia and Palestine. Nor is it easy to see how news of S. Paul's work at Thessalonica should travel to any of these places, with the possible exception of Rome, with such rapidity as to justify S. Paul's language.

The only explanation seems to be that the phrase is a rhetorical exaggeration, based on the glowing accounts given by S. Paul in letters to his friends in Syria and elsewhere of the Thessalonian Christians. However long S. Paul may have stayed at Beroea, it seems necessary to suppose that this is the case; the widely-scattered Christian Churches could hardly have heard much about Thessalonica by the time S. Paul reached Corinth. Cf. 2 Cor. vii. 14 and ix. 2, from which it appears that S. Paul on other occasions spoke with a considerable degree of exaggeration, and *μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ* in Ro. xv. 19.

Objections based on the supposed difference of tone in the two letters are very precarious, especially when they are intended to show that the first letter was addressed to the whole Church, but especially to the Gentiles, the latter to Jews only. There is no reason why S. Paul should write less cordially to Jewish Christians than to Gentiles. Explanations as to the Second Coming would be as much needed by the ordinary Jews of the Dispersion as by Gentile converts, since it is hardly likely that the Jew of the lower class, who was ready to abandon the Law and fraternize with Gentiles, was very well instructed as to the teachings of Palestinian eschatology on the Messianic kingdom (cf. note following). S. Paul's changes of tone can hardly be used to prove either that one letter is spurious or that the two, if genuine, are addressed to different groups of readers. There is far less variation than is to be found in different sections of such a letter as 1 Cor. A sufficient explanation would be that the evils of which S. Paul complains in 1 Thess. iv. 10 seemed to him so serious that after sending the first letter he decided to follow it up with another more severe in tone to make certain of suppressing them. But the data

for a full explanation are wanting. On the other hand, S. Paul is subject to so many fluctuations of temperament that such changes are to be expected. A writer capable of the fluctuations of 2 Cor. vii. 1–16 is capable of anything.

43. S. Paul's main object in writing apart from natural affection and the desire to encourage his converts in the face of persecution is to correct these misunderstandings. From 1 Thess. it seems that he had described the Messianic kingdom as having already begun. This was simply a slight extension of the popular Jewish beliefs noted in c. I. nn. 54 and 56; the Christian dispensation may be regarded either as the closing stage of the old or the first stage of the new order of things. The Christian already belongs to the Day, which will be the consummation of the existing order; and in virtue of the fact that he belongs to the Day, he is already in some sense outside that order.

The teaching of 1 Thess. iv. 13 *seqq.* is remarkable and confirms to a considerable extent S. Luke's account of the brevity of S. Paul's stay at Thessalonica (cf. n. 5). It appears that S. Paul's heathen converts were in the same state as Jews who had not hitherto accepted the belief that the coming of the Messianic kingdom would bring with it the resurrection of all who have died before it. They have been taught to hope for deliverance from sin (1 Thess. iii. 13) and its punishment (1 i. 10), but are not clear as to what will happen to the Christian who dies before the actual time of the Second Coming. Clearly such difficulties imply that the amount of teaching which S. Paul had given was very limited. His reasons for harping so strongly on the apocalyptic side of his teaching cannot be ascertained. For a fuller discussion of this error cf. c. VII. § iii. nn. 30, 37.

44. The extent to which other parts of the province were evangelized by S. Paul at this period is doubtful. There was a community at Cenchreae (Ro. xvi. 1), and S. Paul claims to have preached as far as Illyricum (*ib.* xv. 19); but it is hardly possible to avoid the suspicion that the latter phrase contains a certain element of exaggeration. It would be possible to suppose that S. Paul paid a series of visits to towns lying on the route from Corinth to Rome, such as Patrae and Dyrrhachium, and that S. Luke has omitted them as minor activities which may be ignored in view of the general concentration of S. Paul's labours on large centres. More probably, however, the phrase simply means that having evangelized Macedonia and Achaea, he has reached as far as Illyricum—a decidedly hyperbolical expression. It is indeed possible that Christians from Corinth were known by S. Paul to have preached in these parts, and he might in a sense claim therefore that their work was the result of his own labours. Since, however, no tradition connects the Churches of these regions with S. Paul it must be regarded as most probable that the words are an exaggeration. It is implied in 2 Cor. i. 1 and xi. 10 that there are other Christians in the province, but this need imply no more than isolated converts, who had met S. Paul at Corinth, although not permanently resident there; such converts might have a small Christian community in their houses. There is therefore no certain evidence that there were organized Churches as apart from small domestic groups in any of the cities of the province but Corinth and Cenchreae. Athens appears not to be counted in the province, since Stephanas in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 is the firstfruits of Achaea, while in i. 16 he is obviously a Corinthian convert. In excluding Athens S. Paul is correct, since it was not only a free city, but also a "peculiar jurisdiction" of its own, into which the proconsul of Achaea had no official right to enter (*P.R.E.* I. 258).

45. This appears from the fact that he is able to preach at Ephesus on his way from Corinth to Jerusalem.

46. By establishing the Church at Ephesus S. Paul could visit all his Churches between the Syrian Antioch and Corinth without leaving the track of one of the main routes of travel (cf. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 388). Although the Macedonian Churches lay off this line of travel, it would always be easy to visit them from Ephesus, which formed a centre for all three groups. (For S. Paul's visit to Corinth during his stay at Ephesus cf. c. VII. § iv. n. 6.)

47. See c. VII. § ii. nn. 8 *seqq.*

48. The Bezan reading in Acts xviii. 21, δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, is probably true to the facts, although its insertion is simply due to the desire to harmonize this journey with that of Acts xx. 16.

49. The Nazirite vow could only be fulfilled in Jerusalem, although it could be undertaken anywhere. In such cases the Nazirite had to reside for thirty days in Palestine before the vow could be fulfilled. This was the less rigid view, since the Nazirite would thus spend in the Holy Land the shortest period for which the vow could be taken; according to the stricter view the whole period for which the vow was taken had to be spent in Palestine. The phrase *ξύρασθαι τὴν κεφαλήν* is generally used in a more or less technical sense of the completion of the vow, when the Nazirite's hair was shorn and burnt on the altar with his offerings (see Nu. vi. 13 *seqq.* for the procedure at the completion of the Nazirite vow). It is so used in Acts xxi. 24 and *Antt.* XIX. vi. 1. In the present passage it is used of the beginning of the vow, when, although there was no law on the point, common sense would suggest the desirability of shaving the head, in order to minimize the inconvenience involved in this part of the vow. It is apparently used in this sense in *B.J.* II. XV. 1, according to which it was the custom for those who were in any difficulty "to make a vow thirty days in advance of the sacrifice which they would offer, and (to vow that) they would abstain from wine and to shave their heads." This is the literal translation, and it suggests that the practice of shaving the head in advance was so common as almost to be regarded as part of the vow.

It would seem that S. Paul's motive was to prove his loyalty to the Jewish religion, both to the Jews and to the Hebrew Christians at Jerusalem. It is, however, possible that it was made at some time of danger on the journey and was to be fulfilled now, or that it was intended to pledge him to return to Palestine and to act as a guarantee against being drawn into any fresh undertakings.

(For the Nazirite vow cf. Hamburger, *R.E.* I. 785.)

The fact that S. Paul had made such a vow supports the view that he was anxious to be in Jerusalem by the Passover or by Pentecost, since it would seem to have been a custom to combine the fulfilment of the vow with attendance at one of the great festivals. Thus in Acts xxi. 23 we find that there are four Jewish Christians waiting to fulfil the vow about Pentecost. Similarly Josephus records the fact that Herod on his arrival in Palestine assisted many Nazirites to perform the vow, while it has been shown above that his outburst of piety on his arrival is probably to be regarded as the reason for the martyrdom of S. James, the son of Zebedee, and that both events coincided with his arrival in Jerusalem for the Passover of A.D. 41 (c. V. § ii. n. 15). There was no legal requirement that the completion of the vow should coincide with a festival, but the Jews of the Dispersion would naturally combine the two acts of devotion.

Thus the vow to a certain extent confirms the view, which is probable on other grounds, that the end of S. Paul's mission to Corinth falls at the opening of the travelling season, and that his stay lasted from the late autumn of one year to the spring of the next year but one (cf. above, n. 36).

50. Acts xviii. 20. Here the Jews actually press S. Paul to stay and explain his teaching more fully. Clearly nothing had been said to excite their hostility.

CHAPTER VII

THE COLLECTION FOR THE SAINTS

§ i. PREPARATIONS

On his arrival in Jerusalem[1] Paul proceeded to make his arrangements for the fulfilment of an object, which in his eyes had been for some time past of the highest importance. This was the fulfilment of the obligation, undertaken on the occasion of his visit to Jerusalem during the famine of A.D. 48, that his Gentile converts should "remember the poor." He had himself supported with enthusiasm the original collection made by the converts of Antioch, and had been anxious to continue the practice. Although he might have pleaded that the subsequent attitude of Peter and the reopening of the controversy on circumcision had invalidated the original agreement, yet he had not in fact done so, and the obligation to undertake the collection remained as a debt of honour which he was bound to fulfil[2]. In the eyes of the Hebrew Christians it was a definite obligation, by which the Gentiles would prove their solidarity with the original hearers of the preaching of the Master.

None the less the fulfilment of the obligation was not in all respects an easy matter. Jewish converts of the Dispersion would see nothing strange in contributing to the Church which was the centre of Christendom, as they had previously contributed to the Temple[3]. Its members were the witnesses to the Resurrection of the Lord, and it was from them that the faith had spread to the world. They were therefore the visible guarantee of the truth of the new teaching and the unity of all believers, just as the Temple was the visible token of the truth of the Law, and the unity of the Jewish nation throughout the world. Similar ideas would be familiar to those who had been proselytes of Judaism, or who had advanced a considerable distance in the direction of assuming the burdens of proselytism[4]. On the other hand, those who had been converted direct from heathenism, or at best from a very loose attachment to the synagogue, might be difficult to convince. They had no natural love of the Jew, and though united in faith with some members of the nation, yet they were in many cases suffering persecution at the hands of other members of it[5]. It might well be feared that they would have little enthusiasm for the scheme.

None the less, it was essential that it should succeed. Paul could hardly hope to convert the Jewish Dispersion and through it the

Gentile world, if the witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus, the one fact on which his whole teaching rested, denied his claim to teach the faith which he professed to have derived from them, or regarded his beliefs as different from their own[6]. Hence the unity of Jewish and Gentile Christians must at all costs be preserved. The task was not easy, since the main body of Christians in Palestine only accepted his teaching under protest[7]. Their rulers were indeed in complete agreement with him, but only one of them permanently resided in Jerusalem, while it was always possible that the remainder would not continue to confine their labours to the Jews of Palestine, but would themselves proceed to the Jews of the Dispersion[8]. On the other hand a large Gentile contribution to the needs of Jerusalem would tend to conciliate the Christians of the city and to minimize the danger of friction between the two elements in the Church.

The danger was by no means negligible. The frequency of communication between the Jews of the city and their brethren of the Dispersion rendered it inevitable that the Hebrew Christians should soon become familiar with the conditions obtaining in the Churches of the Gentiles[9]. The atmosphere of purely Jewish Churches in Palestine was however widely different from that obtaining in the mixed communities of Pauline origin. This was inevitable. To the Hebrew Christian the Gospel was simply the fulfilment of the religion which he had always held. It changed nothing, but added certain new obligations in the way of outward observances, while transferring the whole emphasis of life from the performance of outward actions and the compliance with external regulations to the attainment of the highest possible degree of personal holiness. Both elements had been present in his earlier religious life, and both remained: but the emphasis was changed from the former to the latter. His outlook was moulded on that of those who had seen the Lord, Whose return was awaited by His followers at every moment. In the meanwhile the external forms of the Christian life, such as the Eucharist and the outward manifestations of the Spirit, occupied only a secondary place as compared with the attempt to achieve Christian perfection, the pattern of which, as manifested by Jesus, was known to some by personal acquaintance, and was familiar by hearsay to all[10].

The Gentile communities were in a different position. News of the earthly life of Jesus had in general only reached them from those who had seen little or nothing of Him in the flesh. The starting-point of Pauline teaching was the fact of the Resurrection, the historical

evidence for which was laid before the convert with the fullest detail[11]. This was the main guarantee of the Christian faith, the second being the visible evidence of the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, as manifested in the outward forms of miracles, speaking with tongues, and prophecy[12]. The common meal of the Church on the first day of the week, with its solemn eucharistic conclusion, was a far more prominent feature of the life of the Christian, when it was not counterbalanced by the observance of the sabbath and the worship of the synagogue. Thus the religion of the Gentile Churches, with its frequent outpourings of the Spirit, and its emphasis on the Eucharist and common meal, carried with it a far stronger emotional appeal than the developed Judaism of the Hebrews[13]. At the same time it was coupled with a far lower standard of moral development. This was inevitable, for the Gentiles, except in so far as they had been trained by previous membership of the synagogue, could hardly fail to relapse from time to time into the sins of the past. For most of them it was a matter of the utmost difficulty to rise to the level of Christian morality at all, and there could be no question of their emulating the rather pietistic standard of perfection at which the Hebrews aimed[14]. The place of that piety was indeed taken in certain cases by an asceticism, which Paul himself favoured; but that asceticism tended to bring with it a puritanical attempt to enforce the same standard on others and to concentrate itself to an excessive extent on the observance of external mortifications and the neglect of the spiritual purpose, from which alone they derived their value. Such an asceticism might easily become as dangerous as the laxity of others[15], especially when, as was natural, it produced among the less balanced an excessive scrupulousness, which was continually being scandalized by the seeming carelessness of their neighbours[16]. On the other hand, there was in some quarters a tendency to acquiesce in and even to justify not merely moral laxity, but a deliberate repudiation of the obligation of any moral standard at all, a tendency due to a by no means unnatural misinterpretation of Paul's teaching as to the liberty which was the privilege of the Christian[17].

Thus the Hebrew Christian, who had learnt either from hearsay or from a personal visit of the conditions prevalent among the Churches of the Gentiles might find much to criticize. The collection was to serve as a proof of the solidarity of both elements in the Church[18], and as a testimony of the admiration of the Gentiles for their more advanced brethren. It would also entitle them to the

benefits which the piety of the Hebrews could confer on their benefactors. For they were doing all that was in their power to support the piety of the Hebrews in respect of the one point in which it needed material support. In the eyes of the Hebrews poverty was an essential element of holiness; and except in so far as wealthy converts happened to be made in Jerusalem the Church in the city could only continue to exist by means of the assistance of less perfect but more practical Christians. Here the Gentiles could help; and in virtue of their help they were entitled to benefit by the amends which the perfection of the Hebrews could make for the deficiencies of the Gentiles[19].

The position was thus a complicated one. Paul could not simply order the Gentiles to contribute, since he could not represent it as being in any sense a matter of Christian obligation[20]. He could only appeal to their generosity and stimulate that generosity by emphasizing the past and present services to the faith of the Hebrew Christians. At the same time he was handicapped not merely by the natural antipathy of the Gentiles towards the Jews, stimulated in some instances by the continuance of persecution, but also by the fact that he had had in some cases been compelled to resist with the utmost vigour the attempt of the very people for whom he was appealing to establish a permanent Jewish supremacy within the Church[21]. On the other side was the probability that the collection, unless it was large enough to evoke genuine gratitude from the Hebrews, might easily prove worse than useless. An unsuccessful collection would prove the lack of interest felt by the Gentiles for the Mother-Church, and might actually increase the danger of a rupture between Gentile and Jewish Christians throughout the world[22].

Before proceeding with the actual work of raising the collection, Paul naturally desired to confer with the rulers of the Church in Palestine. As on the occasion of the Council he could hope to make the visit sufficiently private to escape the attention of the Jews in the city[23]. His old enemies of the Hellenist synagogues had ceased to be on the watch for the teacher whom they had once sought to murder. Cumanus, the procurator[24], had no love either for the Jewish nation or for their rulers, and was not likely to connive at any attempt on the part of the authorities to remove him by legal methods, while it was unlikely that those authorities would hear of his presence in the city. It was some sixteen years since he had lived there and been known as the rising leader of the Pharisees; the Sadducees had long

since forgotten him. On the other hand his labours among the Jews of the Dispersion had not yet attracted sufficient notoriety to make his name familiar to the Jewish world at large. It was only at Corinth that he had created real difficulties for the local rulers of the community, and the danger of meeting with any of the Corinthian Jews on a brief visit was not great enough to need serious consideration[25]. Thus he could visit the city and explain to the local Christians his proposals for carrying into effect the promise made some five years previously. The matter was one in which he could only proceed slowly. The extent of the distance he had covered and the small amount of work he had been able to devote to some of his Churches made it necessary to allow them plenty of time, if the collection was to reach any considerable sum. It was impossible to excite their enthusiasm for the project without careful preparation, while the actual collection must also cover a considerable period of time. The contributors were mainly drawn from the very poorest classes, and could hardly produce anything except by laborious weekly collections[26]. Further his journey was to centre on Ephesus, and to include the evangelization of that city and the province of Asia. It was thus necessary to reconcile the Hebrew Christians to the prospect that the collection would not be completed for a period of several years.

In view of the fact that he had strong personal opponents among those whom the collection was intended to benefit, Paul could hardly undertake it without the most careful agreement with the Christian leaders in Jerusalem as to the methods of carrying it out. In order to safeguard himself from all danger of hostile criticism either on the ground of lack of enthusiasm for the scheme, or on the ground of personal dishonesty, and also in order to free himself from the burden of devoting all his time to matters of business, he secured the appointment by the leaders of Hebrew Christianity of a colleague for his forthcoming journey[27]. This colleague would at the same time be able to assist Paul in the work of preaching the Gospel and organizing the Churches[28], and thus fill the place taken by Silas and Barnabas on previous missions.

Having fulfilled his business at Jerusalem and performed the vow, which was the proof to the Hebrew Christians of his loyalty to the faith of the nation, Paul proceeded to Antioch with his new colleague. After a brief stay here he proceeded overland to Galatia, where he was able not only to confirm the faith of his converts, but also to put before them his projects for the assistance of the Church in Jerusalem,

a matter which, in view of his relations with that body at the time of his previous visit, needed a considerable amount of explanation. Thence he proceeded to Ephesus, thus realizing the plan he had designed for his journey two years before. The party included, besides Paul's Apostolic assistant, Timothy, Titus and two Macedonian converts of Jewish extraction, Gaius and Aristarchus[29], if not others. The size of the party was dictated by the needs of preparing for the collection, and also of supervising the various groups of converts during the period of the forthcoming mission. None of the Churches founded on the last journey had yet stood the test of time, and it was obviously desirable to utilize the central position of Ephesus for the purpose of superintending their development. Paul could use the services of his assistants, when he could not find an opportunity for leaving the central sphere of his operations.

Silas was not included among the members of the party. His omission from it, coupled with his subsequent association with Peter, may perhaps be interpreted as evidence that the latter had decided to undertake the task of visiting some of those regions where the faith had already reached the synagogues of the Dispersion, but had not as yet developed into any organized form, and persuaded Silas to accompany him. The experience of Silas would assist him in the task, while his presence with Peter would prove the harmony of the latter with Paul in regions where his name was known to any who had heard of the Christian movement[30]. Meanwhile Paul, after leaving his Galatian Churches, proceeded direct to Ephesus. Although the cities on his route offered tempting opportunities he left them untouched, trusting that the effects of his work would make themselves felt throughout the province, even if he should prove unable to spare them time for a personal visit at a later stage[31].

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII, SECTION I

1. The supposition that "the Church" which S. Paul greets in Acts xviii. 22 is simply the local Church of Caesarea involves a grotesque misunderstanding both of S. Luke's method of writing and of the actual situation. That S. Luke should mention the entirely unimportant detail of a visit to the local Christians in Caesarea at a moment when he is taking S. Paul from Ephesus to the Pisidian Antioch *via* Palestine and Syria in a single verse is unthinkable. Further S. Paul was under a Nazirite vow which could only be fulfilled in Jerusalem, and his refusal to stay at Ephesus can only be explained by the fact that it was a matter of urgency for him to return to Palestine. There could be no urgent reason for visiting Caesarea and we hear nothing of any long stay at the Syrian Antioch. On the other hand the business of arranging the collection for the Saints could hardly be undertaken without consulting the Church at Jerusalem, who were primarily concerned. This fact S. Luke covers by the bare notice of the visit to Jerusalem, just as he mentions

once in Acts xxiv. 17 the fact that S. Paul's visit to Jerusalem was connected with the collection which he otherwise ignores. This very scanty allusion to a matter which held such importance in S. Paul's eyes at the time is very remarkable. The reasons for it are shown below. See n. 27.

2. For the circumstances in which S. Paul undertook the obligation to support the Hebrew Christians see c. v. §. iii. n. 20. In view of S. Luke's treatment of the whole subject it is possible that he has simply omitted to mention in his account of the Council of Jerusalem any condition that the Gentile Christians should support the Hebrew Christians, although such a condition was in fact made. It is, however, more probable that the question was not raised and that the agreement made on the occasion of S. Paul's famine-visit was not discussed in any form at the Council. S. Paul, however, would naturally desire to fulfil his promise after his complete triumph, although it may be presumed that he would have repudiated it, had the Council failed to meet his demand that Gentile converts should be exempted from the Law. For further evidence as to the nature and extent of this obligation see the notes on this Section.

3. For this tax, payable by all adult Jews, and employed for the upkeep of the Temple, cf. *G.J.V.* II. 314 *seqq.*

4. It is noticeable that it is only in the two Corinthian Epistles and Ephesians that the Church, or the individual Christian, is described metaphorically as the Temple of God. That the allusion in this metaphor is due to the influence on S. Paul of the temple of Artemis of Ephesus is out of the question. As is pointed out in Dr Armitage Robinson's commentary on the Ephesians (pp. 66 *seqq.*) the metaphor of the "corner-stone" (Eph. ii. 20) is only applicable to an Oriental building. Similarly in Eph. ii. 14 there is a clear allusion to the barrier excluding Gentiles from the inner court of the Temple (cf. Armitage Robinson, *ad loc.*). In any case S. Paul would regard the temple of Artemis at Ephesus as one of the abominations of the heathen, built for the worship of the works of men's hands, and would not dream of insulting his converts by comparing them to it. The allusion coming in a passage addressed specially to Gentile converts is remarkable as showing that S. Paul must have spent some time in describing the Temple to his converts; the passage would be meaningless to those unfamiliar with the Temple at Jerusalem. This series of allusions in the three Epistles which are particularly connected with Ephesus is due to the fact that during his residence there S. Paul has been engaged for some three years in persuading his converts, many of them Jews and proselytes or adherents of Judaism, to support the Christians of Jerusalem. His mission has been based on the city which was the centre for the collection of the Temple-tax for the Jews of Asia, and recognized as such by the Roman government (see below, § ii. n. 11). (In the case of the Ephesians he is writing to the converts of the district surrounding Ephesus, if the letter is a circular, and not addressed to Ephesus in particular, but in any case to Christians, many of whom had been known to him at the time when he was making the collection.) Thus in 1 Cor. iii. 9 *seqq.*, Eph. ii. 20 *seqq.*, the Church is the true Temple of God. Just as for S. Paul the Christians are the true Jews, and their faith the true version of the old Law (cf. c. IV. § i. n. 36 and c. VI. § i. n. 26), so now the Christian Church is the true Temple. S. Paul has been used to arguing on behalf of his collection among the Jews of Asia that the Church is the true Temple and therefore that the old obligation to support the Temple has now taken the form of an obligation to support such portions of the Church as need assistance, until the description of the Church as the true Temple has become a commonplace of his thought and speech. This is confirmed by the charge made against S. Paul by the Jews of Asia in Acts xxi. 28 that he teaches all men everywhere against the people and the Law and against this place (*i.e.* the Temple). The charge is simply the unbelieving Jews' version of S. Paul's teaching that the Christians are the true Israelites, the Gospel the true Law, and the Church the true Temple. From the point of view of such Jews the charge was justifiable. In 2 Cor. vi. 16 the statement "we are the Temple of the living God" shows the transition by which the metaphor passes from its original use of the whole Christian society to its use of the individual. The transference lay ready to S. Paul's hand in a circle of ideas with which he was familiar; for in *De Somn.* ii. 37 (M. 1. 691) Philo shows that the prophecy contained in the words of Ps. xlvi. 4, 5 cannot be

taken to apply to the existing Jerusalem, in which the Temple stands, since it is far from any sea or river. Thus the city of God must be understood as applying either to the whole world, or to the soul of the righteous man, which is a city of God. The argument is proved by a reference to Lev. xxvi. 12, as is S. Paul's in this passage. The introduction of the quotation from Leviticus in both cases is remarkable and seems to indicate that the passage was a commonplace of Jewish propaganda, intended to demonstrate that the idea of the soul of the righteous man as the Temple of God was familiar to Moses. From this use is derived that of 1 Cor. vi. 19, where the individual Christian is the Temple of the Holy Ghost.

5. We have no direct evidence of persecutions directed against the Gentile Churches by the Jews of the Dispersion but cf. c. VI. § v. n. 11. It would seem that this is the explanation of the curious language of 1 Thess. ii. 14 *seqq*. The persecutions of the Thessalonians are ascribed to the Gentiles, but S. Paul displays a manifest hostility to the Jews. There seems no reason for his introduction of the allusion to the sufferings of the Christians of Palestine here, a subject to which he does not often allude, and which he cannot have described at any great length in his brief stay at Thessalonica. It seems that S. Paul has in mind the probability that he will at some future date be asking for the alms of the Thessalonians for the Churches of Palestine. Hence he emphasizes the fact that the Gentiles are apparently the cause of the sufferings of the Thessalonians, whatever their real source may be (they were probably in fact largely instigated by the Jews), and that the Jewish Christians suffer in the same way from the Jews of Palestine, his object being to impress on them that the Jewish Christians, for whom he will shortly be appealing, are as much isolated from their own brethren, the orthodox Jews, as are the Thessalonians from their own fellow-countrymen, and are no less persecuted by them. Similarly he fails to notice that the obstacle to the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles proceeds very largely from the Jewish Christians and does not simply come from the orthodox Jews.

6. The whole of S. Paul's teaching rests on the Resurrection of Our Lord, as a historical event to which trustworthy witnesses can be produced (1 Cor. xv. 1 *seqq*., note especially the emphatic ἐν πρώτοις in *v*. 3, 1 Thess. iv. 14, Col. ii. 11 *seqq*., and cf. Acts xiii. 32 *seqq*., xvii. 31, xxvi. 23). The emphasis laid by S. Paul on this point is confirmed by the fact that the readers of his Epistles are presumed to be familiar with the leading figures of Palestinian Christianity (Gal. i, ii, 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6, Col. iv. 10). The explanation of this familiarity with the names of persons in Palestine, some of whom were not on the best of terms with S. Paul during the earlier period of his missionary activities, is that they are the witnesses to whom he is bound to appeal for evidence of his claim that the Resurrection is a demonstrable fact, to which living testimony can be called.

7. See below, § iii. n. 10.

8. For the probability that S. Peter's departure from Palestine, and possibly that of other Apostles also, dates from the end of S. Paul's second journey, see below, n. 30.

9. The position of Jerusalem as the object of pilgrimage from all parts of the world, and as a centre to which yearly collections were brought by the leading members of the Jewish communities of the Dispersion, made it easy for the Jews of the city to learn of any events that affected the life of those communities. It is to be remembered that there was at this period no general separation between the orthodox Jews and the Christians, and the former, in so far as they were definitely hostile to the Church, would be ready to use any accounts of disorders among the Gentile communities to discredit Christianity. Thus the Jewish Christians would in a sense feel themselves discredited by any abuses prevalent among the Gentile Churches. (For the relations of the Christians to the rest of the nation at this period cf. c. III. § ii. nn. 7, 17, 24 *seqq*. The same absence of any general separation between Jews and Christians in Judaea appears in S. Paul's vow, his action in Acts xxi. 26, and the incident of Acts xxiii. 16.)

Further it is clear from the events preceding the Council of Jerusalem that Hebrew Christians might often be found visiting the Churches of the Gentiles, though here it seems that we are dealing with a deliberate attempt to upset S. Paul's labours. For the subsequent visits of Hebrew Christians to Corinth see below,

§ iii. Whether these visits were due to the desire to propagate the Gospel, or to the desire to interfere with S. Paul's work, or whether they were merely the result of Jewish migration from Palestine for commercial reasons, it is clear that the Jews of the city had ample means for ascertaining the state of affairs in any of the Gentile Churches.

10. Although the "breaking of bread" and the visible manifestations of the Holy Ghost appear in the first chapters of Acts as a regular feature of the life of the first Christians in Jerusalem (c. I. Appendix I and Appendix on the Primitive Eucharist), they are an addition to the worship of the synagogue and the Temple, and therefore would not impress themselves so strongly on the mind of the Jewish Christian as they would on that of the Gentile, who had never known the Jewish forms of worship, or had abandoned their use (cf. c. v. § i. n. 21). Consequently, in the Epistle of S. James, we have no mention of either, and the same applies to 1 Peter, which, although written for mixed communities, is thoroughly Hebrew in its familiar use of the more popular portions of the O.T. Scriptures, such as the prophets, Psalms and Proverbs, and in its use of Isaiah liii as a Messianic prophecy (cf. c. I. n. 23), as against the allegorization of the Pentateuch, characteristic of the educated Judaism of the Dispersion as represented by S. Paul and Philo.

On the other hand, apart from the treatment of the Eucharist in 1 Cor., we find allusions to the external manifestation of the Holy Ghost in all the earlier Pauline Epistles (Ro. viii. 15, 26, xii. 6, 1 Cor. *passim*, 2 Cor. vi. 6, xi. 4, xii. 1 *seqq.*, 12, Gal. iii. 5, iv. 6, 1 Thess. v. 19, 2 Thess. ii. 2), the allusions in each case implying the familiarity of the phenomena in question. It is noticeable that the emphasis is strongest in 1 Cor., a letter addressed to the Church in which the Gentile element is most largely predominant, and least under the control of converts brought up in Judaism.

It is to be noted further that the same situation is implied in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The readers are in danger of falling away from their faith on account of the overthrow of the old system of the Temple-worship and the fact that without it they have very little to keep them stedfast. Hence the insistence on the duty of attendance at Christian worship (x. 25, xiii. 10), and on the duty of realizing that Christianity involves much more than the initial act of faith and repentance which precedes baptism and the accompanying "laying-on of hands" and certain eschatological beliefs (vi. 2). This conception of Christianity is a decline from the past state of Hebrew Christianity (v. 11, 12), and is unworthy of those who have been admitted to the Sacraments of the Church (vi. 4 *seqq.*, where baptism, the Eucharist and the receiving of the Holy Ghost are the distinctive features of the Christian life, the last-named being probably a reference to visible manifestations). It would seem, however, that the declension of the Hebrew Christians is due to the fact that this side of the Christian life never occupied a very high place in the mind of the ordinary Hebrew convert, and that the loss of the Temple, coupled with the tendency to exclude Christians from the synagogue, has left them in a more or less helpless position. We have no direct reference in the Epistle to exclusion from the synagogue, but it may be presumed that this accompanied the persecutions referred to in x. 32 and xii. 4 (cf. c. III. § ii. n. 7).

11. Cf. n. 6.

12. For the evidential value of these manifestations cf. 1 Cor. ii. 4, xiv. 22 *seqq.*, Gal. iii. 4, 5, 1 Thess. i. 5.

13. It is not of course intended to imply that the ethical aspect was absent from Gentile or the emotional from Hebrew Christianity. It would, however, seem that the emphasis laid, more or less unconsciously, on the two sides of Christianity differed in the manner indicated in the text. Thus the failure of the Corinthian Church is the result of a Christianity which is based mainly on the emotions and has failed to appreciate its moral responsibilities. In part it is probable that this was due to S. Paul's own temperament and his appeals to the emotions of his converts, cf. Gal. iv. 13 *seqq.*, 1 Thess. ii. 1 *seqq.*, 2 Cor. i. 8 *seqq.*, ii. 4, 14, vii. 11 *seqq.*, etc. Naturally in his absence the convert who had until recently been a heathen with at the most a loose attachment to the synagogue might easily lapse into the sins of his past life. For these failings at Corinth cf. below, § iii. nn. 3 *seqq.* It must of course be remembered that without this appeal to the emotions, whether

in the form of S. Paul's own preaching or in the developed sacramental system of the Church, the Gospel would have made little more appeal to the Gentile world at large than the synagogue had done. The tone of S. James and 1 Peter shows far less of this appeal to the emotions: the writers regard Christianity far more as a struggle to attain to moral perfection; cf. the note following.

14. Cf. c. I. n. 44. It is to be noted that although 1 Peter contains a warning against the vices which Jewish writers commonly ascribe to the Gentiles (1 Pet. ii. 11, iv. 3, and cf. c. I. n. 49), yet in the latter passage, in which alone the usual catalogue is given, such sins are treated as a matter of the past life of his readers when they were heathen, or as sins known by hearsay to the Jews, not as urgent temptations to be faced by the Christian, as they are *e.g.* in Gal. v. 21, and as they quite clearly are in the case of the Corinthians. Similarly the virtue of humility plays a far greater part in S. James and 1 Peter than in the Pauline Epistles. Thus to S. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 21 *seqq.*) obedience to rulers or masters is a positive imitation of Our Lord; in Ro. xiii. 1 *seqq.*, Eph. vi. 5, it is a matter of accepting the will of God. The typically Hebrew use of the antithesis of pride and humility in Jas iv. 6 and 1 Pet. v. 5, 6 (cf. c. III. § ii. n. 35) is not found in S. Paul, who no doubt taught and practised humility, but would seem to have practised it by grace and not without difficulty (cf. c. IV. § i. n. 42, c. VI. § v. nn. 42, 44, or his struggle to refrain from boasting in 2 Cor. xi. 16). See further, § iii. nn. 12 *seqq.*, for a fuller discussion of the shortcomings of the Corinthian Church as they would strike the Hebrew Christian.

15. For the dangers alluded to in the text as they affected the Church of Corinth see below, § iii. They were, however, present elsewhere, Corinth being the instance of their fullest development. For the danger of a self-centred asceticism leading to spiritual pride cf. Col. ii. 21 *seqq.* (for the meaning of this passage cf. Baker, *Holy Wisdom*, I. iii. 11: "They place perfection in an exact performance of outward observances and austerities, the which, though being well used, they may be certainly very proper helps to perfection, and accordingly are to be duly esteemed, yet, if they be undertaken for any end of nature, and not for the purifying of the interior, and disposing it for more perfect prayer, are of no value at all, but rather proceed from and nourish self-love, pride, etc."), 1 Tim. iv. 3 (the presence of this form of puritanism among the Gentile communities is evidenced by this passage, whether the Epistle be genuine or not).

16. Cf. note preceding, and Ro. xiv–xv. 6. The scrupulousness of the Christians whom S. Paul here describes as the weaker brethren is only to be distinguished from the puritanism of those referred to above by the fact that at Rome they are a minority who have no means of enforcing their views on others.

17. This tendency pre-eminently made itself felt at Corinth. That it was felt elsewhere, and attributed to S. Paul's teaching, is clear from Ro. iii. 8, vi. 1. Cf. the story of Nicholas of Antioch related by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* III. iv. 25), and the perversion of it, if Clement's account is correct, into the Nicolaitan heresy. For dangers of this kind in the early days of the Gentile Churches cf. Rev. ii. 14, 20. It is not necessary to suppose that the various distortions of Christianity described were prevalent among the whole of any Christian community or even the majority of its members, but it is clear that they were of sufficient frequency to disturb S. Paul, and therefore to be noticeable to a visitor used to the Christianity of Palestine.

18. 2 Cor. ix. 13, Ro. xv. 27. The former passage shows the far-reaching nature of the claims made by the Church of Jerusalem. The willingness of the Gentiles to contribute is the proof of their submission in the matter of faith to the true Gospel, of which that body is the trustee. In view of the fact that S. Paul is able to use so strong an expression in writing to his Gentile converts, it is safe to presume that the Hebrew Christians held views as to their position which were at least no less exalted. For the sense in which submission to the Church of Jerusalem on the part of the Gentiles proved their orthodoxy see n. 6.

19. 2 Cor. viii. 13 *seqq.*, ix. 14. The first passage is remarkable, since the assistance rendered by the Gentiles is to be regarded as a service to be rendered ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, for which the Hebrews are to make a compensation at some καιρός, which is unspecified. It is, however, clear that the καιρός at which the Hebrews are to make their return is the Second Coming of Our Lord, regarded as the beginning

of the future age, as in Ro. xi. 5, where S. Paul contemplates the conversion of the rest of the nation as accompanying the consummation of all things (*ib.* 25). Thus it appears that the piety and prayers of the Hebrews at the day of judgment are to fill up the ὑστέρημα of the Gentiles, just as the alms of the Gentiles at the moment fill up the ὑστέρημα of the Hebrews. For a somewhat similar conception cf. Philo, *De Execr.* 9 (M. II. 436), where the Messianic restoration of Israel is to be aided by the prayers and merits of the patriarchs. The emphasis on the piety of the Hebrews and their services to the rest of the Church is, however, strongest in 2 Cor. viii. 9. Here S. Paul states his doctrine of the Incarnation, not, as in Phil. ii. 7, in terms of Hellenistic philosophy, but in language which deliberately alludes to the current use of the term πτωχοί of the Hebrew Christians (cf. c. v. § iii. n. 20). The voluntary self-humiliation of Our Lord at the Incarnation is thus stated in terms of the voluntary poverty of the Church of Jerusalem.

20. Cf. Ro. xv. 26, 2 Cor. viii. 8. For the reasons which lead S. Paul to be so emphatic in repudiating the idea that he is giving any order here as against 1 Cor. xvi. 1 see below, § iii. n. 38, § iv. n. 3.

21. This can only be conjectured, but it is hard to avoid the supposition that S. Paul must have found it difficult to explain to the Galatians the change of attitude between the writing of the Epistle and an appeal for alms similar to that of 2 Cor.

22. This is apparently the explanation of S. Paul's manifest anxiety on the subject and the request of Ro. xv. 31 for prayers that his collection may prove acceptable to the recipients. Clearly it might not prove so. The inference appears to be that the Hebrews regarded themselves as having a quite definite claim to it, and would be offended if it were not large enough. If it were a purely unsolicited piece of generosity on the part of the Gentiles, the Hebrews could hardly be offended however small it might be, and S. Paul would not be so anxious as to ask the Romans to pray that it might prove acceptable.

23. It is noticeable that on the occasion of the famine-visit, the Council, and the present visit S. Paul is able to go to Jerusalem and to enter the Temple without danger. On the other hand on the occasion of the last visit the danger is manifest beforehand, and S. Paul is aware of the risk he is taking. The reason is apparently to be found partly in the greater privacy of these visits and the later increase of his notoriety as a result of the labours of his mission in Asia (see below, § ii. n. 21), partly in the change of political conditions in Palestine.

24. For this official (Ventidius Cumanus, A.D. 48–52) see c. VIII. § ii. nn. 1, 2.

25. There would be little serious danger of such a meeting during a comparatively brief visit, during most of which S. Paul could avoid appearing in public, even if a certain number of Corinthian Jews happened to be in Jerusalem.

26. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. The work of the collection has already been mentioned at Corinth as is shown by the language in which S. Paul alludes to it in this passage. The work in Galatia is already well under weigh. S. Paul is writing before Pentecost and apparently about Easter, while he hopes to come to Corinth and possibly to spend the winter there. This would allow at least a whole year for the collection, although he hopes that much of it will be finished by the time he arrives. For the poverty of the Gentile converts cf. 1 Cor. i. 26, 2 viii. 2.

27. 2 Cor. viii. 18 *seqq.* The person referred to is described together with another unnamed Christian as an Apostle. "The brother whose praise in the Gospel is, or runs, through all the Churches" must be either a brother who has a reputation as an evangelist, or a brother who is mentioned with praise in the Gospel, *i.e.* plays some part in the history of the life of Our Lord and is known as a witness of His Resurrection. The former is far the more probable explanation, and implies a Christian evangelist of some standing. We are further told that he has been appointed by the Churches to be S. Paul's fellow-traveller in the matter of the collection. The Churches referred to cannot be the Gentile Churches, since it is unthinkable that there should have been any opportunity of holding a meeting even of representatives of the various Pauline Churches to appoint a joint representative for the purpose. Moreover if he were appointed by them he would *ex hypothesi* have been appointed by the Corinthians among others, and S. Paul could hardly refer to him in this language, if he were a person whom the Corinthians themselves had shared in nominating. On the other hand S. Paul could hardly write "the Churches" of any

particular group of Gentile communities in addressing a community of another group. The phrase would be, to say the least, impolitic, and in the passage 2 Cor. viii–ix S. Paul is using every effort to avoid giving any offence to his readers and to efface the consequences of past misunderstandings. The obvious group of Christians to whom he could refer as "the Churches" in such a passage are the Churches of Palestine, as represented by the Apostles and other leading Christians who supervised them. The phrase has thus the same meaning as "the Churches of Judaea" in Gal. i. 22, cf. c. III. § ii. n. 20 and c. VI. § ii. n. 32. It is, moreover, more natural that S. Paul would desire to safeguard himself against complaints from the Jewish Christians than against possible criticisms from the Gentiles. At the outset of his journey he had no reason for supposing that there was any danger of opposition to him among the Gentiles, since he had not heard of the disorders at Corinth, and was still under-estimating the strength of the opposition when the first Epistle was written.

It would indeed be possible to suppose that his companion was appointed by the Church of Antioch as the metropolis of Gentile Christianity, and a Church which, with its Syrian daughter-Churches, might be of enough importance to be styled "the Churches." It is, however, to be observed that S. Luke makes no mention of any Apostolic colleague of S. Paul on this journey. On the other hand all precedent demands that S. Paul should, like the rest of the Apostles and in accordance with the practice of his previous journeys, be accompanied by a colleague of equal rank. Yet S. Luke ignores the presence of any such colleague, although the passage under consideration is evidence that such a colleague existed. It has been noted above (c. VI. § iii. n. 5) that in the case of Silas S. Luke is careful to distinguish between the visit of Silas to Antioch as delegate of the Council, and his subsequent connection with S. Paul on his second journey. This care is due to the fact that he had opponents who cast doubts on his position as an Apostle (cf. below, § iii. n. 10). Here the explanation appears to be the same. S. Luke is anxious to refute opposition to S. Paul, the memory of which still survives, and to assert his Apostolic authority against those who had represented him as merely a delegate of the Church of Jerusalem, who had grossly exceeded his authority. He has already done so by pointing out that Silas on the second journey was freely chosen by S. Paul as his colleague, after the separation from S. Barnabas; he does so in the present case by ignoring the existence of the colleague appointed by the Hebrew Christians to assist him in the work of the collection. This is entirely in accordance with his whole treatment of the collection, which is only mentioned incidentally in Acts xxiv. 17, although it was one of the matters which S. Paul had most at heart throughout the journey. The explanation of his treatment of the matter is the same as that of his silence as to the colleague. He is anxious to maintain S. Paul's authority against those who would represent him as merely an agent for collecting alms for the Church of Jerusalem from the Gentile converts, and therefore treats the collection as a mere incident to be dismissed by a casual reference, the insertion of which is sufficient to guard him against the charge of falsifying his narrative by omitting all reference to a matter of such importance.

The identity of the colleague cannot be ascertained. In Ro. xvi. 21 S. Paul refers to a companion named Lucius, a person who does not appear in the corresponding sections of S. Luke's narrative. We know from Acts xiii. 1 that there was an eminent Christian at Antioch of this name, a Cyrenean convert of high standing and apparently one of the original refugees from Jerusalem at the time of the persecution of Stephen (c. IV. § i. n. 68). It would be tempting to identify the two persons. In this case it would seem that while S. Paul asked the leaders of Palestinian Christianity to appoint him a colleague, they replied by selecting one of his old colleagues at Antioch. But this is a pure conjecture, the name being too common to justify any attempt at certainty in the matter. But the casual introduction of this colleague at a different point in the narrative would be entirely in keeping with S. Luke's whole treatment of the collection, while the eminence of Lucius in the Church is clear from the fact that in Ro. xvi. 21 he precedes Jason and Sopater. On the other hand we should expect him to precede Timothy, who, however, was better known to Christians in the West as having accompanied S. Paul on his second journey and may have been acquainted with some of the Roman converts (cf. c. VI. § v. n. 41).

28. As in fact he assists to do in 2 Cor. viii. 18 *seqq.*

29. The word συνέκδημοι in Acts xix. 29 is very peculiar if it merely means that they were with S. Paul at the time, although they were of Macedonian extraction, and not that they were his companions on the mission. If the latter explanation is correct it would seem to follow that they were Macedonian converts who had accompanied him from Corinth to Jerusalem or had met him there while visiting the city as pilgrims. In either case it is to be supposed that they were Jews, resident in Macedonia, since S. Paul would hardly take Gentiles to Jerusalem unless it was necessary to do so. It is therefore natural to identify Aristarchus with the person of the name in Col. iv. 10, who is of the circumcision. Here again, however, certainty is impossible.

30. It is, of course, only possible to conjecture the date of S. Peter's final departure from the region of Palestine and the beginning of his labours in the Gentile regions. It is, however, probable that Silvanus in 1 Pet. v. 12 is to be identified with Silas, the colleague of S. Paul's second journey (who appears as Silvanus in the Thessalonian Epistles). If so, it is again probable that his association with S. Peter dates from the close of S. Paul's second journey, and is to be attributed to the desire of S. Peter to have a companion with experience of work among the Gentiles. The fact that the letter is addressed to a group of Churches which are to be visited by a circular journey beginning at Pontus and ending in Bithynia (Hort, 1 *Peter*, 157–184) is suggestive. The region which such a journey would naturally traverse comprises the northern part of Galatia, Cappadocia, and the main road from Ephesus to the East, and would then proceed to the northern parts of Asia and return to Bithynia. I am inclined to venture the suggestion that S. Peter had travelled through this area himself, though not in the same circular direction, coming from Palestine through Antioch by one of the two roads leading to the main Eastern route, *i.e.* either that passing through Comana or that passing through Tarsus, Tyana and Nazianzos, and proceeding thence in the direction of Asia. This route lay to the north of that travelled by S. Paul in his visits to the Galatian Churches. Thence he might well journey through some of the parts of Asia in which we find the Church established in the Apocalypse, which S. Paul did not, so far as we know, visit in person (Philadelphia, Sardis, Smyrna, Pergamos), and then turn east and visit Bithynia. This can only be conjectured, but it is worth noting, since it suggests the possibility of a mission undertaken by S. Peter, which deliberately avoided the area of S. Paul's earlier labours. If so, it might well be the result of an agreement reached on this visit of S. Paul to Jerusalem.

31. For S. Paul's route on this occasion see Note on Galatia, c. VI. § i. Ramsay's view that τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη in Acts xix. 1 means the more hilly route from the Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus, running through Tralla, cannot be maintained. It is of course possible that S. Paul used this route, but the words are only intended to resume the narrative from xviii. 23, and mean "the inland region," the last incident having taken place in Ephesus. The fact that according to Col. ii. 1 he was unknown by face in Colossae, Laodicea and Hierapolis, the former two being on, and the last only a short distance off the southern route, cannot be used as evidence, since S. Paul in his haste to reach Ephesus may well have passed through these towns without preaching. It is, of course, possible that he took the hillier and less populous route to the north to avoid preaching.

§ ii. EPHESUS

In the autumn of A.D. 52[1] Paul was able to begin the work at Ephesus, which he had vainly attempted two years before. In itself the city offered opportunities greater than any of the cities which he had visited hitherto with the exception of the Syrian Antioch. Its population was larger than that of any other city of the province of Asia[2], of which it was the centre, while the province was the richest

and most populous in the Empire. Commercially Ephesus formed the junction between the Mediterranean and the land-routes to the East. As a centre of religious devotion the temple of Artemis of Ephesus was second to none of the great shrines of Asia, and its influence extended to every part of the civilized world[3]. Thus the city formed a centre for visitors and pilgrims of every kind, through whom Paul could hope to propagate the Gospel in regions which he was unable to visit himself. At the same time the size of the city and the fact that it was the seat of the proconsular government offered a reasonable hope of security from violence and illegal persecution[4].

These however were not the only motives which led Paul to concentrate his energies on Ephesus on this occasion. The province of Asia had been for centuries one of the great centres of the Dispersion[5], and it was primarily through the Jews of the Dispersion that Paul hoped to reach the Gentile world. At Ephesus the Jewish colory had more than a century before included among its members Jews who enjoyed the privileges of Roman citizenship, and possessed sufficient influence to secure exemption from military service in the wars that followed the murder of Julius Caesar[6]. The Jewish worship at this period enjoyed the recognition and protection both of the Roman government and the city, and similar privileges were granted to the Jews in other Asiatic cities, in some cases owing to the intervention of the Roman government on their behalf against attempts at oppression on the part of the civic authorities[7]. At an even earlier date the Jews of Asia were sending large sums of money to Jerusalem in payment of the annual tribute for the upkeep of the Temple. But the disturbed conditions prevalent in the East during the later years of the Roman republic had exposed the remittances to grave risk of loss, whether through piracy or the cupidity of Roman magistrates and Eastern monarchs. It was a matter of no small difficulty to secure the transmission of these sums to the Holy City, and it had even been found safer to divide the whole of the sums so collected into instalments in the hope that some part at least would find its way to the proper destination, or else to deposit the collections of several years in some place of safety until conditions were sufficiently settled to allow a fair prospect that the treasure would not be intercepted on its way[8].

The Jews of Asia benefited in common with the rest of the world by the reign of security introduced by Augustus. In particular it became possible to safeguard the Temple-contributions from robbery or to obtain redress in the case of loss through such causes. The

general practice was for the Jews of the cities of the Dispersion to entrust their contributions to the leading members of the community, who proceeded to travel in the company of fellow-delegates from other cities of the neighbourhood up to Jerusalem[9]. In Asia the natural meeting-place for the delegates was Ephesus. Thence they could travel by sea to Palestine, this route being quicker and safer than the overland journey[10]. The use of Ephesus for the meeting-place was under the Empire protected by a special Imperial edict[11]. The city had therefore a special importance as a meeting-place for Jews of the Dispersion, and Paul could hope to find means for diffusing his message far and wide among the cities of Asia through the agency of his fellow-countrymen whom he would meet on the occasion of their gatherings at Ephesus.

This legal recognition of the Jewish practice of conveying money from Asia to Jerusalem had however further advantages from Paul's point of view. The Imperial authorities were not likely to interest themselves in the precise objects for which the alms collected by Jewish piety for the benefit of the nation were to be employed, particularly if the inquiry involved listening to long disquisitions on Jewish theology. The Imperial rescripts were so vaguely worded that they could be invoked as protecting the practice of collecting money at Ephesus and transmitting it to Jerusalem for any purposes connected with the Jewish religion. In Paul's eyes the collection for the Hebrew Christians possessed the right to protection hitherto enjoyed by the contributions to the Temple. It was the offering made by the true Israel for the benefit of those who had inherited the privileges which the rest had forfeited by their disobedience to the Gospel[12]. The Hebrew Christians as the witnesses to the Resurrection and the true exponents of Christian piety could claim to be to the new dispensation what the Temple had been to the old, namely, the central and most impressive testimony to the one true God and His covenant with His Chosen People[13]. Thus theologically the Gentile Christians in supporting the Church of Jerusalem were fulfilling the duty foreshadowed in the contributions of the nation to the Temple. Legally the offering was made by the followers of a particular form of Judaism for the benefit of the followers of the sect resident in Judaea, and the collection was therefore an act of piety connected with the Jewish faith and for the benefit of the Jewish nation, which Paul could represent as entitled by the edict to the protection of the Imperial Government[14]. It was therefore both natural and desirable to choose Ephesus as the centre of the collection. It would emphasize in the

minds of Jewish converts from Asia the continuity between the new teaching and the old; it would also make it easy to avoid questions on the part of the Imperial authorities as to the legality of collecting money in Asia and transporting it to Jerusalem, and to defend the proceeding in the event of any such question being raised[15]. Naturally this method of procedure would only increase the hostility of Jews who rejected the new teaching; for although Paul might not teach converts who were of Jewish origin or already proselytes to discontinue their payment of the yearly contribution to the Temple, yet he certainly would not impose any obligation of payment on his Gentile converts, who might otherwise have furnished numerous proselytes to Judaism. On the other hand it was unlikely that any Roman magistrate would inquire closely into the exact objects of his collection or listen to Jewish complaints as to Paul's proceedings, and thus he could hope to organize his collection under the privileges granted to the Jews without interference.

Meanwhile, during the period of Paul's visit to Jerusalem, his friends Aquila and Priscilla had been carrying on the work of propaganda among the Jews at Ephesus. Among those whom they were able to instruct was an Alexandrine Jew named Apollos, who had himself been affected by the moral and spiritual revival of orthodox Judaism set on foot by John the Baptist[16]. His knowledge of the Baptist's teaching included a general acceptance of the belief that the Messiah would shortly appear, but did not extend to the later facts of the life and Resurrection of Jesus. A vague belief of this kind in the coming of the Messianic kingdom did not among Jews of the Dispersion involve any breach with the synagogue, since its professors knew nothing of the revolutionary attitude to the Jewish Law developed by Paul in his dealings with the Gentiles. Apollos, however, under the influence of Aquila and Priscilla, was persuaded to accept not only the full conception of the Messianic claims of Jesus involved in the later stages of His history, but also the deductions as to the abolition of the Law which Paul based on that history. The skill of Apollos in the system of allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, as expounded in the schools of Alexandria, rendered him a serviceable ally, especially for the purpose of impressing the Jews of the Dispersion. Paul's comparative failure to influence them at Corinth left an obvious opening for Apollos to visit the city and carry on the work among the Jews which had been interrupted by the breach between the Church and the synagogue[17]. Accordingly Apollos, with the encouragement of Aquila and his fellow-Christians

at Ephesus, proceeded thither and opened his attack on orthodox Judaism at Corinth about the time when Paul, after visiting his Galatian converts, arrived at Ephesus.

In view of the fact that he contemplated a lengthy visit, and also in view of the importance of the city as a centre of Judaism, Paul naturally found it advisable to open his campaign with an attempt to conciliate the synagogue by a gradual exposition of his conception of what the acceptance of the Messianic claims of Jesus involved[18]. For three months he continued his work without any open quarrel, and during this period was able among others to win over a small body of disciples of John the Baptist to a fuller view of the faith whose beginning had been marked by the appearance of the prophet[19]. Besides these converts others were made among the followers of the ordinary form of Judaism before the synagogue grasped the whole implication of his teaching and opened a campaign of opposition of such violence that Paul with his followers was forced to secede from it and organize the Church as an independent society. In order to exercise a greater influence on the Gentile population he established himself in the school of a certain Tyrannus, giving daily lectures after the manner of the Gentile teachers of the time. Thus, in his double capacity of an exponent of the true form of the Jewish religion, which had been divested of many of the features which had hitherto been an obstacle to its full acceptance among the Gentiles, and also as a teacher of a new religious revelation, he was able to exercise without leaving Ephesus a wide influence over the whole province of Asia. His reputation was enhanced by cases of miraculous healing of diseases, which the opinion of the time inevitably demanded from the teacher of a new religion[20].

On the other hand, the success of his labours necessarily intensified the hostility of the Jews. Hitherto he had indeed excited the hostility of single Jewish colonies, but had not gained a general notoriety as a false teacher throughout the Jewish world. Henceforth, however, he was marked out as the leader of a movement which was responsible for the disturbance of the unity of the Jewish religion throughout the whole Empire from Syria to Rome. The fact that he was permanently quartered at one centre and the influence which he wielded not only in Asia, but also on the other side of the Aegean, and the fact that it had proved impossible to interfere with him by legal methods, marked him out from the more obscure itinerant missionaries who had hitherto been responsible for the isolated outbreaks of the Christian movement in various widely-separated localities. More-

over, the fact that he was appealing for alms not for the Temple but for the Christians of Jerusalem was a serious blow to the prestige and position of the authorities of the nation. The rulers of Jerusalem could learn from the delegates who brought the annual payments from Asia that Paul was diverting from the synagogues potential proselytes, who might otherwise have been sending their yearly dues for the upkeep of the Temple and its priesthood. Nor would their indignation be lessened by the knowledge that the same Gentiles were sending their alms to the Christian community in the city, for the Sadducees had no love for that body, although at present the patronage of the Pharisees made it impossible for them to suppress it. Henceforth Paul had to face in Jerusalem not only the suspicion of the orthodox Jews and the hostility of the Hellenist synagogues. He was also marked out as a dangerous enemy of the Temple and its authorities. As long as he remained at Ephesus he was safeguarded by the proconsular authority; but he had seriously increased the dangers that awaited him if he should ever return to Jerusalem[21].

For some two years Paul continued his labours at Ephesus. In spite of vigorous opposition from Jewish and other quarters, his influence extended and Christian communities were established even in cities which he was unable to visit in person[22]. Hitherto his missions had threatened the position of the synagogues of the Dispersion by depriving them of their claim to possess a form of religion which was the only one compatible with the enlightened monotheism of Gentile philosophy. At Ephesus, however, the new faith made itself felt in quarters which had hitherto been content with the old Gentile religions, and had been untouched by the propaganda of Judaism[23].

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII, SECTION II

1. For this date cf. c. VI. § v. n. 36. Assuming that S. Paul left Corinth in the spring of A.D. 52, and proceeded to Ephesus after a comparatively brief visit to Jerusalem, the Syrian Antioch, and the Galatian Churches, he would reach Ephesus by the late summer or early autumn. His stay at Ephesus lasts according to Acts xix. 8, 10 for two years and three months, a period roughly described in xx. 31 as three years. None of the figures given can be pressed too closely. It is not quite clear whether the three months of xix. 8 are included in the two years of *v.* 10, the latter period representing the whole of his residence at Ephesus, or whether they are to be regarded as stating respectively the duration of the missions to the Jews and to the Gentiles; the latter seems, however, the more natural interpretation. Similarly, it is not certain whether the period of two years carries us up to S. Paul's departure from Ephesus or only up to *v.* 21 and S. Paul's decision to leave. On the whole, however, it seems probable that the language of xix. 8, 10 is intended to give the whole duration of S. Paul's stay at Ephesus. This suits the language of 1 Cor. xvi. 8, where S. Paul expresses his intention of leaving Ephesus at Pentecost. A visit lasting from the autumn of 52 to the Pentecost of 55 would indeed be nearer

two years and six months than two years and three months, but the figures are only used roughly. It is also possible that S. Paul did not reach Ephesus until the beginning of winter. He would naturally desire to spend as long a time as possible with his Cilician and Galatian converts.

2. For a general description of Ephesus cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *R.E.* v. ii. 2753, Leclercq in *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.* v. 118, and Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* i. 720. Beloch (*Bevölkerung der Gr.-Rom. Welt*, p. 231) estimates the population at a quarter of a million. The data are too inadequate to allow of any confidence in the figure; but it is certain that Ephesus was the largest of the cities so far evangelized by S. Paul apart from Antioch.

3. The temple of the Ephesian Artemis was the largest and wealthiest in Asia (Pausanias, *Descr. Graec.* vii. 5, cf. Strabo xiv. i. p. 647). For a description of it cf. Strabo xiv. i. p. 641. For the wide diffusion of the cult of the Ephesian Artemis cf. Paus. *Descr. Gr.* ii. 2, iv. 31, Strabo iii. iii. p. 159, iv. i. pp. 179 *seqq.*

For further information as to the cult cf. the references in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.E.* v. ii. 2773, Art. "Ephesia," and the preceding note. See also Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, c. vii.

4. See above, c. vi. § v. n. 2.

5. For the evidence as to the Jewish colonies in Asia see *G.J.V.* iii. 12 *seqq.* For the number of Jews even under the Republic cf. n. 8.

6. *Antt.* xiv. x. 19.

7. *Antt. ib.* § 25 (Ephesus), cf. §§ 20–24 for Laodicea, Miletus, Pergamos, Halicarnassus and Sardis.

8. The dangers which attended the arrangements for transferring the large sums of money collected by the Jews of the Dispersion to Jerusalem in the republican period are brought out in *Antt.* xiv. vii. 2 (quoted from Strabo), according to which Mithridates carried off 8000 talents deposited at Cos by the Jews. Josephus expressly records that this sum represents the moneys collected for the Temple by the Jews of Asia; but even so it would seem that it represents the collection of several years, and that it was found necessary to hold them over for some time owing to the disturbances of the Mithridatic wars. Further evidence on the point is to be found in Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 28. In 62–61 B.C. Flaccus confiscated the whole of the sums collected in Asia for the Temple, so far as he could lay his hands on them. At Apamea one hundred pounds weight of gold was seized, at Laodicea twenty pounds weight, an unknown amount (the figures are missing) at Adramyttium, and a small amount at Pergamum. These figures cannot simply represent the local collection of the cities concerned. Allowing the Tyrian half-shekel or didrachm (the amount of the Temple-tax) to be the equivalent of two *denarii*, of which twenty-five went to the *aureus*, the *aureus* at this period being issued at thirty-six to the pound (Hill, *Historical Roman Coins*, p. 94), we should have to allow for no less than 45,000 adult male Jews at Apamea alone. (Only adult male Jews (and proselytes) were liable to the tax.) It is clear that in fact the sums represent the collection of the whole of Asia, and perhaps of a larger area, which is being sent up to Jerusalem by instalments for the sake of safety. This view is confirmed by the fact that not much was taken at Pergamum. In view of the importance of that city, and the alliance made by it with the Jews (*Antt.* xiv. x. 22), it may be assumed with safety that the colony of Jews was a reasonably large one, and that the bulk of the money collected there had already been despatched, or else that the money confiscated happens to represent the collection from Pergamum alone. (Since one pound of gold, on the basis of the above reckoning, would represent 450 adult male Jews, who alone were liable to pay the tax, it is clear that no single city could produce any very large sum on the scale of reckoning on which Cicero is arguing.)

It may therefore be concluded that the moneys confiscated at Apamea and Laodicea, representing between them the collection of 54,000 adult male Jews, formed the bulk of the collection raised in Asia and Greece. The fact that the confiscation took place at two inland cities on the road from Ephesus and Syria, shows that the land-route was considered safer than the voyage by sea. Although Pompey had overthrown the pirates five years before the seas were still not entirely safe (cf. Cic. *ib.* 13), though if the amount seized at Adramyttium on the coast had

been preserved, it is possible that it would indicate a division of the whole collection into two main instalments, one that sent by land and captured at Apamea and Laodicea, and the other sent by sea and captured at Adramyttium. During the period of the Mithridatic wars it had apparently been safer to use the sea, since the money was deposited at Cos. Under the Empire the sea-route was used (cf. n. 10).

9. For the Jewish practice in this matter cf. *Antt.* XVIII. ix. 1, Philo, *De Mon.* ii. 3 (M. II. 224), *ἱεροπομποὶ τῶν χρημάτων εἰσὶν ἀριστίνδην ἐπικριθέντες. ἐξ ἑκάστης δὲ (πόλεως) οἱ δοκιμώτατοι χειροτονοῦνται*, cf. *Leg. ad Gaium* 40 (M. II. 592). The large escorts which according to Josephus (*loc. cit.*) accompanied the collection from Babylon to Jerusalem would not be needed within the Empire.

10. There is no direct evidence that the usual practice was to convey the collection by sea. But Ephesus would be a more convenient meeting-place for a journey to be made by sea, whereas for a journey by land Laodicea would be more convenient. Further, the land-route was exposed to brigands in the Taurus region as late as the reign of Claudius (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 55).

11. That Ephesus was specially recognized as the centre for the collection of the contributions of the Asiatic Jews is clear from the rescripts quoted in *Antt.* XVI. vi. 4 and 7. The first, that of Agrippa to the city authorities of Ephesus, might be regarded as being addressed to them only in virtue of their positions as custodians of the temple of Artemis and the right of asylum attached to it, part of the object of the rescript being to deprive of the right of asylum anyone who robbed the Jewish collection (if the reading *χρήματα* be accepted: with *γράμματα* the reference is to sacrilegious thefts of the Scriptures). The latter, however, is a rescript addressed by Julius Antonius to the city authorities of Ephesus, which refers to the rights granted to the Jews by Augustus and Agrippa to use their own laws and to meet together for the purpose of conveying their contributions to Jerusalem. Antonius proceeds to confirm this right. The reference to the right of the Jews to meet together for the purpose of conveying their contributions to Jerusalem, when addressed to the civic authorities of Ephesus, cannot refer simply to the making of a collection among the Jews of Ephesus and conveying the money from the city to Jerusalem, as do the rescripts of Gaius Norbanus Flaccus to Sardis and Ephesus in *Antt. ib.* 6 and Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 40 (M. II. 592), since it is intended to protect the right of the Jews of the whole of Asia to travel in company in order to convey to the Temple moneys collected for pious purposes (*ἀπαρχάς τε...εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα τῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀνακομιδῆς συμπορευομένους ποιεῖν ἀνεμποδίστως*). Such an edict would only be needed at the spot where the Jews of various cities assembled prior to their departure for Jerusalem. (This is clear in spite of a certain confusion of the text of the passage.) It seems then that Ephesus was by the terms of this edict legally recognized as the meeting-place for the Jews of Asia, possessing thus an importance for S. Paul's purposes entirely independent of its position as the capital of the province and its large Gentile population.

12. Cf. above, § i. n. 4.

13. For the position allotted to the Temple as the one true Temple of the One God in Jewish propaganda among the Gentiles cf. *c. Apion.* ii. 23, Philo, *De Mon.* ii. 1 *seqq.* (M. II. 222).

14. Acts xxiv. 17, where S. Paul in fact represents the object of his mission in this light to Felix; it is described as the bringing of alms and contributions to the nation. It is to be noted that in the rescripts quoted in *Antt.* XVI. vi, while that of Agrippa to Ephesus specifically refers to the Temple-collection, the others merely refer generally to moneys collected by the Jews and sent to Jerusalem for pious purposes. It is hardly likely that any provincial magistrate would inquire very carefully as to the nature of the collection or think it necessary to decide how far S. Paul's proceedings came within the scope of the various edicts.

15. It is to be remembered that apart from the recognized privileges of the Jews S. Paul's collection would according to the economic ideas of the age have been liable to considerable objection as tending to impoverish the provinces in which it was being conducted in favour of Palestine (Cic. *Pro Flacco* 28). Naturally S. Paul's collection would be on a comparatively small scale, but his enemies would hardly have missed the opportunity offered by such a proceeding as the collection for interfering with his work if it had not been protected by the authority of the Empire.

16. The whole question of the nature of the sect or sects which originated from the preaching of S. John Baptist, and their connection with Ephesus, is very obscure. A summary of the evidence as to the sect of Hemerobaptists, which meets us later in the history of the Church, is given by Lightfoot in *Colossians*, pp. 400 *seqq*. For the Mandean view of the Baptist as a "man from God" and therefore the Messiah cf. Reitzenstein, *Erlösungsmysterium*, 125 *seqq*. In spite of certain eccentricities of exegesis, his evidence shows the possibility of disciples of the Baptist who regarded him in this light. The fact that both S. Peter and S. Paul are represented in the Acts as alluding to his mission (Acts x. 37 and xiii. 24), and the apparently controversial tone of the Fourth Gospel as against the view that he was the Messiah, seem to indicate that his followers were at one time numerous, a view which is supported by the narrative of Josephus that he was imprisoned by Herod Antipas for fear that his teaching would develop into a violent Messianic agitation (cf. c. I. n. 18 and c. II. n. 21). The Baptist's repudiation of all claim to be the Messiah (Mk i. 7 and parallel passages in the Synoptists) is well attested and seems hardly open to dispute. On the other hand, we have no evidence in the Synoptists that S. John Baptist ever publicly recognized Our Lord as the Messiah; indeed he seems to have been in doubt as to the point until the end of his life (Mt. xi. 2 *seqq*., Lk. vii. 18 *seqq*.). Even the recognition described in Jno. i. 29 *seqq*. need not be regarded as a public one: it is not clear whether any but the Baptist's immediate disciples are present. Hence it is probable that only the immediate followers of the Baptist knew that he did, not without some doubts, accept Our Lord as the Messiah (Mt. xiv. 12). On the other hand, there must have been many who had heard him preaching repentance and the imminence of the kingdom of God; it is quite possible that he had more followers than Our Lord Himself had. The inference would seem to be that Apollos and the Ephesian followers of the Baptist only knew in fact of their master's summons to repentance and the proclamation of the imminence of the coming of the Messiah. This would explain the later belief that John himself was the Messiah; since his followers had not accepted Christianity and no new Messiah had appeared they might well assume that John himself was the Christ, especially as we have no reason to suppose that his repudiation of the title, as recorded by the Gospels, necessarily formed an invariable part of his discourses.

The extent to which knowledge of the Baptist's teaching was diffused among the Jews of the Dispersion is not easy to estimate. The only places in which we hear of it are Alexandria and Ephesus, two of the great centres of Judaism. Ephesus, of course, was by no means so large a centre as Rome or the Syrian Antioch, but we have no detailed accounts of the introduction of Christianity to either of these two places, and the relations of the disciples of S. John to the Church were presumably settled before S. Paul started his labours at Rome. The allusion to him in Acts xiii. 24 can hardly be taken as evidence that his mission had been heard of in the Pisidian Antioch, although it might be taken to imply that the audience were familiar with his name; it is rather evidence that the speech is a summary of S. Paul's teaching as S. Luke had heard it, and as he wished to represent it to Jewish readers, some of whom might have heard of the Baptist. The fact that we only hear of twelve disciples at Ephesus suggests that the number of Jews of the Western Dispersion affected by him was small. [It is of course possible that these twelve were converts of Apollos, but there is no proof of this.] This view is very strongly supported by the absence of allusions to them in the Pauline Epistles.

For the possibility that the whole incident of the followers of the Baptist converted by S. Paul at Ephesus is inserted on account of the fact that S. Luke's readers were interested in Ephesus, see note at the end of this Section.

17. It is to be supposed that Apollos' power in interpreting the Scriptures consisted in a familiarity with the allegorical system of which Philo was the chief representative. It has been noticed above that S. Paul shows some acquaintance with that system (c. IV. § i. Appendix). At the same time his use of it is comparatively elementary. This is natural, since his object is not to prove that the Old Testament inculcates the principles of Hellenistic philosophy, and his teaching is not primarily concerned with the Old Testament at all, but with the Resurrection

of Jesus and the new conception of religion which that fact involves. Thus it is impossible to conclude from S. Paul's writings as to the extent of his knowledge of such philosophy. On the other hand, the allusion to Apollos is significant, since it would seem to imply that Apollos was in this respect decidedly S. Paul's superior. This inference is confirmed by 1 Cor. i. 12. Apollos would hardly have a body of partisans at Corinth, who regarded him as superior to S. Paul, unless he had in some respects abilities superior to those of the founder of the Corinthian community. Thus it may be conjectured that Apollos was an expert in that style of expounding the Scriptures which was fashionable among the Jewish scholars of Alexandria, and that the comparatively small acquaintance with it which we meet in the Epistles represents fairly accurately the extent of S. Paul's learning in that direction. He had probably read or heard a certain amount of it, but only enough to give him a very superficial acquaintance with it. It is reasonable to suppose that Apollos would address himself mainly to the more educated Jews, who would appreciate his methods of exposition. But his success in converting the leaders of the Jews at Corinth would naturally result in the following of their example by the less educated members of the community and so produce a school of Jewish converts who regarded him as their leader. This is the apparent explanation of the prominence of Apollos at Corinth, but we have no certain evidence.

18. Cf. c. VI. § v. nn. 25, 50. S. Paul's avoidance of a rupture for three months, as against a fortnight at the Pisidian Antioch and three weeks at Thessalonica, can only imply that he was more cautious in his methods of arguing from the Messianic claims of Our Lord to the abolition of the Law.

19. See above, n. 16.

20. The willingness of the age to listen to the public proclamation of a new religious revelation, when duly authenticated by miracles, is best evidenced in Lucian's account of the exploits of Alexander of Abonoteichos. The account of the exploits of Apollonius of Tyana, although not historical, also shows the extent to which a new teacher could attract an audience. S. Paul's teaching in the school of Tyrannus belongs rather to this class of religious propaganda than to the activities of the rhetors and philosophers of the time, with whom Ramsay compares him. This seems to be the explanation of the insistence of the narrative on S. Paul's miracles, and it may be doubted whether S. Paul had either the dialectical subtlety or the rhetorical ability to attract an educated audience (cf. 1 Cor. i. 18 *seqq.*, 2 x. 10). It is probable that at Ephesus, as elsewhere, his hearers were mainly drawn from the poorer class of slaves and freedmen, attracted by the reports of his miraculous powers, rather than from the more educated and wealthy citizens. The fact that some of the latter were interested in his teaching is indeed clear from the action of the Asiarchs in Acts xix. 31. There were, however, many persons of the highest class of society interested in the activities of teachers of new religions, who supported their claims by the exhibition of miraculous powers, however worthless their pretended revelations might be. Thus Alexander of Abonoteichos had the support of many Romans of rank (Lucian, *Alex.* 30). It is also to be observed that the patronage of the Asiarchs does not appear to have extended beyond a friendly interest. It is clear that their position was connected with the worship of the Imperial house, although their exact functions are obscure (see Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B. s.v.* and further in *J.R.S.* XII. 155). It seems therefore that their patronage did not extend to the length of embracing the Christian religion, which would hardly have permitted them to continue their tenure of office.

The Bezan text endeavours to harmonize the statement that S. Paul lectured in the school of Tyrannus with the statement in Acts xx. 34 that he earned his own living by labour while at Ephesus, by inserting a note that his lectures were delivered from the fifth to the tenth hour, the time normally devoted to leisure. It is perfectly possible that S. Paul did in fact lecture at these hours and work during other parts of the day; but it is more likely that the statement in xx. 34 is merely a reminiscence of several speeches delivered by S. Paul on this journey or on similar occasions in the writer's hearing, wrongly inserted in the sample of one of S. Paul's farewell addresses, which S. Luke gives on the occasion of his interview with the presbyters at Miletus. It seems difficult to suppose that he could combine daily labour with missionary work on the scale recorded in Acts xix. 9, 10; and it is more probable that he was able to support himself at Ephesus without manual labour.

21. This appears to be the explanation of the change in the position of S. Paul between the time of his earlier visits to Jerusalem and the last. On those occasions he is left unmolested, apart from the first attempt of the Hellenists to assassinate him, although the vow of Acts xviii. 18 necessitated a public appearance in the Temple. On the occasion of his last visit he goes with a foreboding of the utmost personal danger (Acts xx. 22 *seqq.*, Ro. xv. 31), and in the face of urgent warnings from his friends (Acts xxi. 4, 11 *seqq.*), although, until his arrival, there was no reason to suppose that he would need to make any public appearance. He is recognized by the orthodox Jews of Asia, and although the riot is presumably to be attributed to their charge that he was violating the Temple rather than to any knowledge of the crowd as to his personal history, yet it appears from Acts xxii. 21 that the mob know something of his views as to the equality of the Gentiles with the Jews. Otherwise they would hardly interrupt him at this point, since if he had merely attempted to introduce Gentiles to the Church as proselytes of Judaism his action would have been difficult to condemn. Similarly the High Priest Ananias in xxiii. 2 seems to know enough of his teaching to regard him as having no possible defence, while he is also marked out for assassination by forty Jews who would seem to belong to the extreme wing of the zealot faction. The speech of Tertullus describes him as stirring up strife among the Jews throughout the world (Acts xxiv. 5). It thus appears that by the time of S. Paul's final visit the Christian movement among the Jews of the Dispersion and their adherents has become a recognized problem for the authorities of Jerusalem. This seems to be due partly to the wider influence of S. Paul's last mission at Ephesus, and partly to the fact that his collection was definitely diverting from the Temple money which would otherwise have come to it through the contributions of proselytes. (See above, § i. n. 4, and note especially the charge that S. Paul speaks against the Temple. We have no evidence of any attack on the Temple worship, which S. Paul was in point of fact supporting at the moment of the riot. The charge is based on his claim for the liberality of the Gentiles in support of the Hebrew Christians and on his refusal to enforce on them the obligation of becoming proselytes and therefore liable to the contribution to the Temple.)

22. Col. ii. 1 confirms the statement of Acts xix. 10, which is of course a rhetorical expression. It would seem from Col. iv. 13 that there were communities at Colossae, Hierapolis and Laodicea at the time when S. Paul wrote. Although S. Paul has not visited these cities in person, or at any rate has not preached there, he regards himself as responsible for them. It is to be noted that all three cities lie on the line of the main route from Ephesus to the Pisidian Antioch and thence to Tarsus and Syria. It is possible that their foundation is due to the desire of S. Paul to realize his earlier plan of working along the whole of that route from the Syrian Antioch to Ephesus. It would be only the completion of the work which he intended to accomplish on his second journey, and although he could no longer confine himself to that area he might well desire to complete the chain of Churches along the main road before proceeding further afield. Moreover, it would be a convenience to him in travelling if he had friends along the whole road as far as Ephesus. Hence it is probable that he sent some of his assistants to these cities at an early stage of his mission to Ephesus, before he had decided on a visit to Rome (Acts xix. 21, Ro. xv. 23, where perhaps the evangelization of the Asiatic route is the completion of his work in the East to which he alludes).

23. Although S. Paul had made many converts from heathenism among the Corinthians (Κορίνθιοι in Acts xviii. 8 apparently denoting Gentiles outside the influence of the synagogue, as against Ἕλληνας in *v.* 4, which refers to Gentile adherents of the synagogue), yet the narrative of Acts clearly implies that he succeeded in doing so on a far larger scale at Ephesus. The fact that the riot which leads to his departure is organized by a class of workmen dependent for their living on the cult of Artemis shows that his preaching was proving a serious counter-attraction. The possibility of such a rapid success is confirmed by the statements of Pliny (*Ad Tra.* 97), where the spread of Christianity, by quite unknown agents, is represented as having emptied the temples. It would seem that the conversion of Gentiles of the ordinary type, who had no previous interest in Judaism, only begins to assume any considerable proportions at Ephesus.

NOTE ON THE ACTS AND EPHESUS

The space devoted by S. Luke to the founding of the Church at Ephesus and the character of the incidents narrated are somewhat remarkable.

The narrative occupies from xviii. 19 to the end of xix, the number of verses amounting to fifty, or forty-eight if the two verses xviii. 22, 23, which deal with S. Paul's visit to Palestine, be deducted. As against this we have eighteen allotted to the mission at Corinth and the same number to that at Athens. Philippi, in which the author has a particular interest, has twenty-eight verses, and the Pisidian Antioch thirty-eight. Here, however, S. Luke gives the long discourse which is intended to serve as a specimen of S. Paul's addresses to the synagogues of the Dispersion, the same or a similar discourse being implied in all other cases where S. Paul preaches to Jews (the Athenian narrative is expanded by a similar specimen speech to the Gentiles). Naturally no explanation of the length of space allotted to Ephesus would be needed if the incidents related were in themselves of a remarkably striking character. The uproar in the theatre is of importance as showing the extent to which S. Paul's preaching has succeeded in affecting the Gentile world, though even so it is related with a fulness which is rather remarkable in a narrative so highly compressed as the Acts. On the other hand the incidents narrated in xix. 1–20 do not appear to have any such importance. We have the incident of the followers of the Baptist, a summary of miracles stated to have been of a remarkable character, but without any concrete details, the incident of the sons of Sceva, and the conversion of the magicians. None of these appears to possess any great value of its own. The miraculous phenomena attending S. Paul's labours have been described by the specimens given in Acts xiii. 11, xiv. 7 *seqq.*, and xvi. 16 *seqq.*, and we get no similar summary of miracles elsewhere, although we have evidence that they occurred in Gal. iii. 5, 1 Cor. ii. 4, 2 xii. 12.

Of the other incidents, the conversion of the followers of the Baptist might be explained on the grounds that Ephesus was the first city in which S. Paul met with persons of this class, at any rate in that part of his career which is recorded in detail in the Acts. On the other hand it is rather remarkable that the incident should take place here, in view of the fact that the Fourth Gospel, traditionally connected with Ephesus, appears, from its insistence on the Baptist's refusal of all claim to be regarded as the Messiah, to have in view persons who regarded him in that light or were tending to do so. It is possible that there were a certain number of such persons to be found in all the large centres of the Dispersion, but it is curious that we should in each case find them connected with Ephesus. It may be added that the mention of S. John in Acts iii and iv suggests

that S. Luke's readers were interested in him; but this is too small a point to prove anything.

In any case we have no explanation of the insertion by S. Luke of this very unimportant episode, in view of the very large amount that he has omitted in his history. Similarly the incidents of xix. 13–20 have a certain connection with Ephesus since they describe the triumph of Christianity over Jewish and heathen magic, and Ephesus was regarded as a centre of magic learning. On the other hand the incidents of Simon Magus and Elymas have already illustrated this point. The incidents recorded here are not very striking (though it is possible that the story of the sons of Sceva would be more satisfactory, but for the corruption of the text), and hardly add to the value of the Acts as a whole.

It is possible that their insertion is due to the fact that S. Paul is for the first time dealing on a large scale with Gentiles who had never previously been influenced by the synagogue. Such hearers would be far more affected by miracles than by S. Paul's theology, which might well be somewhat hard for them to grasp. Consequently it is conceivable that these incidents are intended to convey to the reader the atmosphere in which S. Paul moved during his stay at Ephesus—an atmosphere in which miracles are the only thing that affects the popular imagination, and in which his teaching apart from them is of little value. On the other hand he must have moved in a rather similar atmosphere at Corinth, and this explanation does not cover the incident of the followers of the Baptist, nor the length at which the uproar in the theatre is described, as against *e.g.* the scene before Gallio, which was of far more practical importance. Consequently it may be asked whether the character of the narrative may not be due to some particular interest in Ephesus felt either by the author or his prospective readers. There is no evidence that the writer of Acts had any personal knowledge of Ephesus, and the vague and rather unsatisfying character of the events recorded tells strongly against such a view. If he had ever paid a long visit to the city he could have collected materials for a far more dramatic story of S. Paul's visit, in the form of narratives of cures regarded as miraculous, and the like. But it is quite possible that he knew that his readers would be interested in S. Paul's activities at Ephesus, but having no detailed knowledge of the incidents of the mission introduced these rather disjointed stories, which comprised the whole of his knowledge on the matter. The insertion of these incidents and the encounter with the followers of the Baptist are in this case due to the writer's desire to gratify the local patriotism of his readers.

It cannot however be claimed that the evidence for such a view is conclusive. It is possible that the followers of the Baptist had, at the time when the Acts and the Fourth Gospel were composed, some local con-

nection with Ephesus, and that they were of sufficient importance as opponents of the Church for the conversion of these twelve persons to be worth recording. (There is of course no reason for doubting the truth of the incident; the difficulty is to explain why S. Luke should think it worth narrating.) If this be the explanation it is possible that the remaining incidents are recorded in order to convey the atmosphere of S. Paul's mission to the city, an atmosphere in which his teaching is tested mainly by his power to work miracles and so to prove his superiority to the Jewish and heathen sorcerers of the city. It may be noted that there is a decidedly magical touch about the miracles of Acts xix. 12, while exorcism was a main form of Jewish magic (*G.J.V.* III. 409); for the reputation of Ephesus as a centre of magic cf. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* I. 722, Art. "Ephesus," and the account of S. Paul's mission there in *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.* v. 128, and cf. the incident by which Apollonius of Tyana liberates the city from the plague (Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll. Tyan.* iv. 10). The narrative of the riot is no doubt due in any case partly to the fact that it was fresh in S. Paul's memory when he met the writer at Philippi on his way to Corinth. But an explanation seems needed for the passage Acts xix. 1–20, which is of a very poor quality as compared with the general level of the Acts; and that explanation may be that S. Luke expected his readers to be interested for local reasons in S. Paul's labours at Ephesus, but had no means of obtaining any better information.

§ iii. THE CRISIS AT CORINTH

[*Note*.—In this Section and the subsequent Sections dealing with S. Paul's difficulties at Corinth the evidence at our disposal is so fragmentary that it is only possible to frame a coherent narrative of the events by resorting very largely to hypothetical explanations of the hints contained in the Pauline Epistles, which are our only authority. The test of such hypotheses is their compatibility with the whole of the evidence. In the text of the narrative I have put forward what appears to be the most probable account of the whole course of events. The evidence on which the narrative is based, and the extent to which it can only be regarded as conjectural, will be found in the notes.]

Paul had already been engaged for two years in his labours at Ephesus[1] when news reached him that all was not well with his converts at Corinth. The origin of the difficulties was due to the ease with which certain aspects of his teaching could be misconstrued. In his anxiety to prove that the Gentiles were not bound to obey the Jewish Law, he insisted on the liberty of those who had once received the Holy Spirit from any burden of legal observance. Such

persons had received a righteousness which delivered them from any duty of keeping the Law; for the Law had never been able to produce in those who obeyed it the righteousness which the Christian attained to in his conversion[2]. His teaching, however, failed to substitute for the Jewish Law any basis of morality for those who had not been educated for some considerable time in the traditions of Judaism. Those whose consciences had not been developed by such a training but had unquestioningly accepted the ordinary standards of conduct of their Gentile surroundings might easily, in spite of their conversion, feel the usual temptations to the sins of their past lives and little or no repugnance to them as inconsistent with the new faith which they professed[3]. The possibility of such a development was rendered easier by the fact that converts were admitted to baptism with little or no previous training in the duties of their new lives[4].

The conditions of the Church of Corinth were peculiarly calculated to allow of this divorce between the acceptance of Christianity as a religion and the observance of the ethics of Christianity. The community was endowed in a remarkable degree with the gift of producing "spiritual" phenomena. The power of speaking with tongues had in particular been manifested with remarkable frequency[5]. The utterances of those endowed with this gift, whether it took the form of articulate speech or of the mere utterance of incoherent noises, were regarded as direct revelations made by the Holy Ghost to the speaker, during the ecstatic trance into which he had fallen—a trance in which he was supposed to be contemplating celestial mysteries. Such persons were naturally regarded with the utmost admiration by those who did not possess such gifts. Unfortunately such abnormal manifestations, induced by the emotional effect of religious enthusiasm, were by no means incompatible with a very low standard of moral conduct, particularly when deliberate efforts were made to produce, if not to simulate, the ecstatic trance which was a necessary condition for receiving revelations of this kind. In this way it was possible for persons who in their daily lives hardly attempted to rise above the general moral level of the heathen world to manifest gifts which were regarded as the highest mark of divine favour. Nor was this the full extent of the danger; it was also possible for such persons to claim that the gifts vouchsafed to them were a proof that their conduct, however contrary to the received morality of the Church, had received the visible ratification of the Holy Ghost. It was difficult for those who were less favoured in respect of spiritual gifts to protest effectively, since they would tend to hold a lower place

in the eyes of their fellow-Christians. If they did so, it was easy to answer them by Paul's own teaching. The Christian was freed from the burden of the Law, and those who sought to set up any rule of Christian morality were merely trying to re-impose part of that burden from which Christ had freed His followers[6]. Their influence was further weakened by the fact that many of S. Paul's best and most faithful supporters at Corinth had been refugees from Rome and had by now returned thither[7]. In this state of affairs certain members of the Christian community at Corinth wrote asking for Paul's advice. He replied to the effect that the Christian must hold no communication with those who were guilty of grave offences against Christian morality, particularly of grave sexual irregularities, however much they might seem to enjoy high spiritual privileges. The Christian must have nothing to do with fornicators[8]. Naturally the intention of his letter was to order the exclusion from the Church of those guilty of sexual immorality, but the wording of his letter, owing to its vigorous condemnation of such immorality, was ambiguous, and could be interpreted as forbidding any kind of association between Christians and fornicators. Such a command was impossible to observe, since it would have involved a complete withdrawal of the members of the Church from any kind of association with the Gentile world[9]. A society drawn in the main from the poorest classes could not order its members to hold no communication with the outside world, and naturally Paul had not intended to imply anything of the kind; but his letter could be interpreted as bearing this meaning, and therefore failed to produce the desired effect, since it could not be literally obeyed.

Meanwhile a fresh complication had arisen. Certain Jewish Christians of considerable eminence in the whole Christian society had arrived at Corinth[10]. They were of Palestinian origin and had been witnesses of the Resurrection. In virtue of this fact, and of the fact that they had received from the Church some general commission to preach the Gospel on their travels, they could claim to rank in a loose sense as Apostles. In so far as the relation of Gentile converts to the Law was concerned they accepted loyally the decisions of the Council of Jerusalem, but none the less on their arrival at Corinth they could find much to criticize[11]. Apart from the perversion of the Gospel already described there were many other failings in Corinthian Christianity which they could not fail to notice.

Among other scandals which neither the new visitors nor Paul himself could tolerate was the fact that Gentile members of the

Corinthian Church were ready to go to law with one another before heathen courts. This practice deserved a double condemnation. It was in the first place utterly contrary to the spirit of brotherhood on which Christianity rested, and was bound in particular to excite the gravest distress in the minds of those accustomed to the communist poverty of the Church of Jerusalem. In the second place it was entirely contrary to all Jewish ideas[12]. Only Jewish courts, either the local courts or the Sanhedrin, were regarded as competent to deal with matters at issue between members of the Chosen People; and the competence of the synagogues to deal with litigation between Jews had to some extent been recognized by the Imperial authorities. The practice of the Corinthians in resorting to Gentile courts was, however, the natural result of their distorted view of Christian liberty. A similar perversion of another part of Paul's teaching had resulted in a practice apparently of the most trivial importance, but equally offensive to the Jewish mind. Women had adopted the practice of appearing at the public worship of the Church with their heads uncovered. In spite of his belief in the equality in Christ of male and female S. Paul's Jewish instincts were entirely opposed to such an innovation, and it would inevitably produce the utmost dismay among the Jewish missionaries, who, however much they might agree to the abandonment of the Law by the Gentiles, held firmly to their Jewish outlook which regarded the inferiority of women to men as part of the Old Testament revelation[13]. More serious disorders had arisen with regard to the celebration of the Eucharist. This act of Christian worship was preceded by the common meal of the Church, the Eucharist being the solemn conclusion. Naturally the whole value of the common meal lay in its sacramental character, as emphasizing the brotherhood of all Christians, a value which would appeal especially to those brought up in the atmosphere of the Church of Jerusalem. At Corinth, however, the preliminary meal had in fact begun to lose its common character. Instead of its being provided by the contributions in kind of each member it had become customary for each to bring his own meal. The richer members ate what they had brought without either waiting for the arrival of others or sharing their contributions with the less wealthy converts. Thus the meal served rather to emphasize social differences than to teach the lesson of Christian fellowship[14]. The exaggerated emphasis laid on the manifestation of spiritual gifts had also resulted in disorders, since in their desire to display their gifts the more ambitious of those who possessed them insisted on giving free play to their powers of

utterance without any regard to order in the conduct of the worship of the Church. Since the utterance of prayers under the influence of the Holy Ghost was a not unusual practice at the Eucharist, this abuse affected that form of Christian worship as well as others which were invested with less solemnity[15]. The Jewish Christians were naturally shocked at these disorders, especially when women were allowed to speak under the influence of the Holy Ghost at the official meetings of the Church[16].

They would be no less shocked at the spirit of aggressive self-assertion which led to them and was the outstanding weakness of the Corinthian community, a spirit in marked contrast to that insistence on the virtue of humility which was the keynote of the moral teaching of the leaders of Hebrew Christianity[17]. They naturally felt it their duty to attempt a reformation. Unfortunately they set about their task in a manner which was bound to lead to friction. Those of Paul's converts, who had really grasped the meaning of his teaching and remained loyal to it, inevitably regarded him as the proper person to rectify the scandals which had arisen. Others had been converted by Apollos or had been influenced by his learning and eloquence to such an extent that he seemed to them a more suitable person to deal with the difficulties. Apollos had by this time returned to Ephesus in order to avoid the danger of seeming to usurp Paul's position among the Corinthian Christians; but the more recent memory of his ministry and his striking personal gifts led some of them to regard him as a higher personage in the Christian world as a whole than the founder of the community of Corinth. They were for the most part Jews and could point to the fact that it was Paul's own over-emphasis of the doctrine of Christian liberty that had led to the troubles in which they found themselves[18].

As against these two sections of opinion the Jewish teachers argued that there was no advantage to be gained by appealing either to Paul or to Apollos. The task of supervising the growth and development of a Christian community lay not with the evangelists who had first founded it, however great their personal brilliance, but with those whom the Lord had appointed for the task, the Twelve, or such persons as they might commission expressly for the purpose. It was contrary to all precedent that Paul or Apollos should claim the right to exercise a permanent supervision over his converts. Paul indeed might claim in a wide sense to be an Apostle[19]. He had seen the Lord after His Resurrection, he had remarkable spiritual powers, and he had been commissioned by the Apostles at Jerusalem to perform

various important duties. But this was all he could claim; and in all these points the teachers from Jerusalem were his equals. As witnesses of the Resurrection they were indeed his superiors[20], while they too had the gifts of the Spirit in a high degree[21]. As regards his formal commission from the Church, Paul had been sent out after the Council of Jerusalem to carry the decrees of that Council to the Galatian Churches in company with Silas, one of the delegates from Jerusalem to Antioch. His Apostolic authority in the strict sense ceased with that duty; since then he could claim no authority beyond that of a wandering evangelist[22]. He had no doubt performed a great service in the spread of Christianity, but he could lay no claim to an Apostolic authority of the kind possessed by the Twelve. Indeed his own procedure proved that he recognized the fact, for he had not, like the Apostles in Palestine, claimed any support from those to whom he preached. This showed that he was not professing to hold any authority but his own[23]. Such was the view of the Jewish Christians; and they urged that in order to put an end to the disorders at Corinth the correct procedure was to appeal to Peter, on whom, as chief of the Twelve, lay the ultimate responsibility for supervising the growth of all Christian communities.

This method of settlement was advanced in all good faith, although it was somewhat unpractical. Peter was not to be found anywhere in the neighbourhood of Corinth, and it was open to doubt whether he was in Palestine or had already left in order to extend his activities over a wider area[24]. Meanwhile the party which openly claimed freedom from any kind of moral restraint was able to profit by the divisions of the more orthodox converts. They rejected all attempts to appeal to earthly authority and referred instead to those principles of liberty proclaimed by Paul himself as an essential part of the Gospel[25]. The divisions of the rest of the community rendered them incapable of enforcing any measure of Christian discipline, and Paul's letter ordering the exclusion of fornicators could not be carried out. Meanwhile the influence of the Jewish missionaries was strong enough to withhold the community as a whole from sending any formal report on the condition of affairs to Paul or asking him to pay them a personal visit to regulate disorders which had grown too serious to be settled by the unaided efforts of the local Church[26].

These, however, were not the only difficulties that had arisen. Among those who were genuinely anxious to follow Paul's teaching there had grown up a certain amount of doubt as to what his meaning on certain points actually was. His teaching on the subject of the

value of Christian asceticism had led to doubts not whether celibacy was better than marriage, but whether the married state was in any circumstances lawful for Christians[27]. There was a further difficulty as to the extent of the duty of the Christian in regard to avoiding the use of meats which had formed part of sacrifices offered in heathen temples. To avoid them altogether would involve the most scrupulous inquiry as to the origin of all meats offered for sale in the markets; while in an opposite direction the admission that it was legitimate to eat such meats in any circumstances whatsoever might be strained by those who advocated the extreme view of Christian liberty to include the right to attend the banquets which usually accompanied the offering of a heathen sacrifice, and practically formed part of the sacrifice itself. This would almost condone participation in the worship of the heathen, and it was even possible to argue that there could be no harm in such participation[28]. Paul had in his preaching used the familiar argument of his nation that the gods of the heathen were merely nonentities, imaginary beings invented by mankind; and it might therefore be urged that there could be no harm in offering them the appearance of outward worship, so long as those who offered it realized that it was a mere outward form with no possible meaning[29].

A further difficulty was that which had already affected the Christians of Thessalonica. Paul's teaching had led his hearers to expect at any moment the return of the Lord. It was recognized that all His faithful servants who were then living would receive the reward of their service by immediate admission to His kingdom; but it was not clear whether those who died before His coming would also have any share in that kingdom. The Christian had at his baptism undergone a resurrection to a new life; it was not clear whether there would be a second resurrection after his bodily death. It was in any case hard to see how the body which had once been buried could be restored to its former state in order that it might enjoy that condition of eternal glory which was to be the portion of the Saints. Hence there grew up a belief that only those who survived until the Second Coming would share in that glory and not those who had passed away before it; their death indeed might be regarded on the strength of elements in Paul's own teaching as proof of their unworthiness of the reward[30].

On this matter, however, and on the scandals which had affected the whole life of the community at Corinth, no immediate action was taken. There was a complete deadlock between the various parties

as to the proper authority to be consulted, as a result of which those who claimed complete freedom from all restraint were free to act on their view of Christianity. In regard to celibacy and meats offered to idols the position was different. The question at issue was the correct interpretation of what Paul had already taught. Moreover, his Jewish opponents had the less reason for objecting to an appeal to him on these points since one of them, the question of meats offered to idols, had been dealt with in the decisions of the Council of Jerusalem. Paul could hardly answer it without a reference to those decisions. But any reference to them was almost certain to be capable of being interpreted as an admission of the superiority of the Christians of Palestine and therefore of their leader, Peter, to Paul himself. He would hardly answer without a reference to the Council, and any reference to it was bound to confirm their claim, that the ultimate authority for the regulation of such difficulties as those which had arisen at Corinth was the chief of the Twelve or such persons as the Twelve should delegate for the task[31].

A letter was accordingly sent to Paul at Ephesus in which the more serious difficulties were discreetly ignored. He was merely asked for a clear statement of his doctrine on these two points, the letter ending with a somewhat exaggerated expression of the fidelity of the writers to his person and the doctrines which he had taught[32]. The letter was received about Easter in the final year of his visit to Ephesus[33]. Paul had not hitherto heard of the difficulties which had arisen, but some Corinthian converts who arrived about the same time gave him a full account of the situation. Paul replied with a vigorous denunciation of the whole body of evils prevalent at Corinth and the moral failings from which they had resulted. Having denounced the spirit of factiousness and ambition which characterized the community, with the divisions and the willingness to desert his authority to which it had led, he condemned unsparingly a scandalous act of immorality committed by one member of the Church and demanded the summary exclusion of the offender until such time as he should amend. He proceeded to denounce the practice of resorting to Gentile courts and the apparently trivial matter of women appearing unveiled at meetings of the Church. He then dealt with the questions asked in the letter of the Corinthians. He had, however, learnt from his Corinthian friends enough of the state of affairs in the city to treat of the subject of meats offered to idols in such a way as to leave no opening for his opponents to convict him of admitting by implication the superiority of the Twelve and Peter to himself as

the proper authority for regulating the whole condition of the Corinthian community. Instead he discussed the whole matter in connection with the fundamental principles of Christianity. Having dealt with the questions raised by the Corinthians, he paid a sarcastic tribute to their professions of loyalty to himself and his teaching and went on to condemn the disorders prevalent in the public worship of the Church both as regards the Eucharist and the manifestation of spiritual gifts, including the manifestation of such gifts by women at the formal meetings of the Church. Here again, while appealing to the practice of other Christian communities in support of his attitude, he was careful to avoid invoking them in such a manner as to imply that their rulers possessed any authority superior to his own[34]. At the same time he left no opening for any complaint that he was lacking in respect for those who were his elders in the faith, using himself and Apollos as examples to prove that none of the leaders to whom the various parties appealed could claim to be anything more than a minister and agent of the Lord. Although at every point in the letter he insisted vigorously on his own claim to be an Apostle in the fullest sense and perfectly competent to deal with the questions at issue, he neither attacked nor criticized others who held a similar rank[35]. Indeed, in dealing with the last of the difficulties of the Corinthians, the question as to the Resurrection, he emphasized his own moral inferiority as a former persecutor to those who had seen the Risen Lord before his own conversion[36].

Having dealt with this error by urging that the Resurrection of Christ carried with it a proof of the possibility of a resurrection, and that the whole recognized practice of Christianity showed the impossibility of holding that those who had died in Christ were lost with the sinners of the world, he demolished by an appeal to the analogy of nature the argument of his opponents that it was impossible to conceive the nature of the body in which the dead would arise. Since in any case all must undergo a transformation before they could enter into the Messianic kingdom it was just as easy to imagine the possibility of the resurrection of the dead in a glorified and non-material form as to imagine the process by which the living were to be transformed into a similar state[37]. At the conclusion of the letter he inserted in rather carelessly chosen language his directions as to the arrangements to be made for the collection for the Christians of Jerusalem, in order to secure that an adequate amount should be ready by the time of the visit which he proposed to make in the ensuing autumn[38]. In order to stimulate the generosity of the

Corinthians he promised that he would himself go with the collection to Jerusalem as the emissary of Corinth, thus lending his personal dignity to the Corinthian community. At the same time he directed Timothy, who was on the point of leaving Ephesus for Macedonia, to extend his journey as far as Corinth, and warned the Christians of the city to be ready to comply with any directions that he might give. For the moment he was occupied at Ephesus, where a new sphere of work had opened itself to him, which he felt bound to exploit to the utmost before his departure, which was fixed for Pentecost.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII, SECTION III

1. Cf. § ii. n. 1. The news as to the state of affairs at Corinth reached S. Paul some time before the writing of 1 Cor., which was written about Easter of the year in which he was intending to finish his work at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 8, and cf. n. 33). It is to be presumed that his intention of leaving Ephesus was actually fulfilled and that the writing of 1 Cor. falls at the end of his residence at Ephesus.

2. Cf. c. IV. § i. nn. 25, 31.

3. Cf. c. VI. § ii. nn. 24, 28. Similarly in Ro. viii S. Paul has to explain how it is possible for those who are freed from sin and from the flesh and are in the Spirit to have any desire to sin; in point of fact he fails to do so, except by the statement that those who have not the Spirit are not Christ's (*v.* 9). This is, of course, no explanation; it merely denies that a baptized Christian, who still feels any desire to sin, is a genuine Christian. In 1 Cor. S. Paul's theology cannot find any explanation for the fact that the Corinthians, having been freed from sin (vi. 11), are still capable of sinning. On the other hand it is plain that many of them still felt the same temptations as before their conversion. Consequently they claimed that the freedom from the Law which they enjoyed permitted them to continue to yield to those temptations, a claim which S. Paul's system in fact involves, since he nowhere envisages the need of a Christian moral Law for those who have been converted to Christianity, but none the less do not find that their conversion has enabled them to walk in the spirit, *i.e.* to live habitually on the spiritual and not on the natural level. Hence in 1 Cor. he is forced to introduce an elementary form of a Christian moral code, but it is entirely inconsistent with his theology in Romans and Galatians.

4. Cf. above, c. VI. § v. n. 41. It would seem that S. Paul had not allowed enough for the possibility that Gentiles might be converted as a result of his preaching and miracles without undergoing any spiritual process of "conversion." Such Christians might even, if they had known nothing of Judaism beforehand, be strangers to the whole idea that religion necessarily had any connection with morality; and in any case they were likely to find that it was not an easy matter to break with the sins of the past merely on the strength of the fact that they had accepted Christianity as the result of a sudden and superficial impression created by S. Paul's eloquence and by reports of his miracles. (For S. Paul's miracles at Corinth cf. 1 Cor. ii. 4, 2 xii. 9.)

It is to be remembered that in most of his earlier missions S. Paul can have had little time to address any Gentiles but those who had already some acquaintance with the teaching of Judaism and were in the habit of attending the synagogue. The length of his stay at Corinth made it possible to address heathen who had no such previous training.

5. See Appendix to c. 1. It is only in 1 Cor. that we have a recognition of the possibility that in certain circumstances these gifts may be anything but desirable. In 1 Thess. v. 19, 20 S. Paul has to emphasize the need of allowing them a free scope. In Gal. iii. 5 the outpouring of such gifts which accompanied S. Paul's first preaching is adduced as evidence of the truth of his message, while in Ro. viii.

15, 26 they are the means by which the Christian attains to perfection; here, however, it would seem that S. Paul includes in the activities of the Spirit the more normal phenomena of prayer as well as such phenomena as speaking with tongues. On the other hand, at Corinth they are so frequent that an undisciplined use of them has become a serious danger to the life of the Church. It seems clear that they were far more common at Corinth than elsewhere. There is no direct evidence that the manifestations of these gifts were due merely to fraudulent imitation; S. Paul never alleges this. None the less, it is clear that in many cases they were by no means of divine origin (1 Cor. xii. 3, and cf. Appendix to c. 1). It is, however, clear that a deliberate attempt is being made by some of the Corinthians to induce the atmosphere of emotional excitement in which such phenomena as "speaking with tongues" are likely to occur, and that there is a great deal of competition in displaying them. In such a situation and among Christians of a somewhat low state of moral development the temptation to fraudulent imitation would be strong and in some cases almost certain to prove irresistible.

6. Clearly there is a tendency to regard the power of "speaking with tongues," as being of an obviously abnormal character, as the only spiritual gift worth possessing, to the exclusion both of prophecy and the "spiritual" qualities necessary to the Christian life (1 Cor. xiii). This would be natural among ill-instructed Christians who had been attracted to it as a superior form of magic, and hoped to earn prominence for themselves by a capacity for displaying the miraculous phenomena which accompanied it. Such persons might easily regard religion as entirely independent of moral conduct, and would see no reason for supposing that their neglect of the ethics of Christianity disqualified them from manifesting the supernatural powers which it conveyed; and they could argue that much of S. Paul's own language supported them.

There is indeed no direct evidence that these powers were enjoyed by the persons implicated in the scandals of 1 Cor. v, vi. On the other hand, it seems difficult to suppose that the main body of opinion among the Christians of Corinth would have been prepared to condone such immorality, unless those who were guilty of it were able to produce some evidence in support of their argument that the liberty enjoyed by the Christian was a liberty from all moral restraint whatsoever. It is, therefore, natural to suppose that the guilty persons belonged to that section of the community which laid most stress on the manifestation of spiritual gifts, and were able to justify their conduct not merely by argument but by the claim that they enjoyed supernatural powers, which would not have been vouchsafed to those who were cut off from divine favour. This would make their conduct very difficult for the rest of the community to criticize.

There is, of course, no necessary connection between the observance of a high standard of conduct and liability to violent emotional outbursts of a religious character.

7. See c. VI. § v. n. 41.

8. The wording of 1 Cor. v. 9 can only refer to a previous letter sent by S. Paul to Corinth and now lost. The circumstances which led to its writing can only be conjectured. On the other hand, it is difficult to explain them except on the hypothesis advanced in the text. Even at the time when 1 Cor. is written there has been no general appeal to S. Paul to regulate the whole state of affairs at Corinth; the graver scandals are not dealt with by way of answer to the questions asked him by the Corinthians, which deal only with the two points of marriage and meats offered to idols (1 Cor. vii. 1–xi. 2; cf. n. 10 below). The remainder of the difficulties have been made known to him by "those of Chloe" (apparently slaves or freedmen of a Corinthian convert) or by other informants.

Thus it seems that the question of fornication was not mentioned in the letter to which 1 Cor. is an answer. At the same time, it is not improbable that the Corinthians should, at the first outbreak of the doctrine that all forms of license were permissible to the Christian, have written to ask for his teaching on the matter, without giving any details as to the extent to which the actual practice of such doctrines had gone. It is, of course, possible that the earlier letter to which S. Paul refers was sent on his own initiative and inserted a warning to have no dealings with fornicators among other exhortations. On the other hand, we have no hint of any motive for such an earlier letter and no reference to its contents.

Hence it seems probable that it was in fact a brief letter addressed to the leaders of the Corinthian Church in reply to a question as to the moral duties of Christians before the beginning of any general revolt against S. Paul's authority.

9. It appears that S. Paul wrote ordering the Corinthians to have no communication with fornicators, that the wording of the letter was such that it might be interpreted as meaning that they were to cut themselves off from all persons guilty of fornication, whether Christians or not, and that the letter in fact proved ineffective. Such a result is intelligible if the advocates of license seized on the ambiguity of the wording, of which S. Paul himself has grown conscious when he writes 1 Cor. v. 9, in order to discredit his whole authority by pointing out that what he advocates is in any case impracticable.

10. The question of the Jewish emissaries at Corinth is the most crucial difficulty of the whole series of historical questions arising out of the two Epistles. The following points are, however, certain and any solution must take them into account.

(1) There is at Corinth a section of the community who claim to be the "party of Cephas."

(2) There has been an attack on S. Paul's authority in regard to the Church of Corinth (1 iii. 10–iv. 21), and his claim to the title of an Apostle (ix. 1 *seqq.*, 2 xii. 11 *seqq.*).

(3) S. Paul's authority has been called in question by certain Jewish Christians of considerable eminence, who have some claim to be considered Apostles (2 xi. 13, 22 *seqq.*), and who depreciate him as compared with some other persons (either themselves or some third group of persons), who have been described as possessing greater claims to the title than S. Paul himself (οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι).

(4) Among his opponents there are some who have letters of commendation to the Corinthian Christians from some source unnamed (2 iii. 1).

(5) The controversy does not relate to the old controversy as to the Jewish Law. There is only one passing allusion to the subject in the first Epistle, the rather irrelevant clause 1 xv. 56^{b}, which has a suspicious air of being a very early interpolation by a copyist familiar with S. Paul's outlook and anxious to explain his language. Probably, however, the verse was written by S. Paul almost automatically in spite of its lack of relevance to the subject he is discussing. It is impossible to suppose that this single clause is his only allusion to a living controversy with Jewish teachers, who are trying to impose on the Gentiles the observance of the Law. Similarly, the allusion to the superiority of the Gospel over the old dispensation in 2 iii. 7 *seqq.* is merely introduced parenthetically, and is not part of a living controversy with judaizing Christians. It contains no argument to which the party of circumcision could possibly take exception, since they too would admit that the old dispensation had been superseded.

(6) The shortcomings and scandals denounced in 1 Cor. are not due to the influence of the Jewish emissaries. It is to be observed that they are of high position in the Christian Church, and therefore the attempt to identify them with the leaders of the antinomian party at Corinth made by Kirsopp Lake (*E.E.P.* pp. 225 *seqq.*) breaks down. We can hardly suppose that there were at this stage in the history of the Church Jewish Christians of high standing, who deliberately advocated antinomianism. The passages quoted by him from Josephus (*Antt.* xx. ii. 4) and Philo (*De Migr. Abr.* 16 (M. 1. 450)) are irrelevant, since they only refer to Jews who reject the obligation of the external forms of the Law, and are no evidence for the existence of Jews of any standing who rejected its moral code, still less of Jewish Christians, holding a position of general estimation in the Church, who advocated such views.

(7) Among others objections which have been raised against S. Paul are his fickleness in changing his plans, and a more obscure objection which is connected with it, and is implied in the wording of 2 i. 15. This is to the effect that his "yea" is not "yea," and his "nay" is not "nay." These objections are dealt with more fully below (see § iv. n. 8). There can, however, be little doubt, in view of Jas iv. 13 *seqq.*, v. 12, that they are the objections of Hebrew Christians accustomed to the somewhat pedantic pietism of Jerusalem and shocked (or affecting to be shocked) at S. Paul's frequent announcements as to plans which he may be unable to fulfil and the vigour of his language.

(8) He has been charged with admitting tacitly that he is not in the fullest sense an Apostle by the fact that he does not expect his converts to provide him with support. In this respect his conduct has been definitely contrasted with that of the Twelve and other leading figures of Palestinian Christianity (1 ix. 1 *seqq.*, 2 xi. 7, xii. 13 *seqq.*).

Now all these facts are capable of one explanation, if we suppose that there has been an attack on S. Paul's authority at Corinth by Jewish Christians, but that their attack is not based on any demand that the Gentiles shall be made to observe the Law, and also that these Jewish Christians are not responsible either for the moral scandals at Corinth or for the disorders attending the public worship of the Church. In any case we have to allow for the fact that there are two main groups of Christians who have thrown over S. Paul's authority, the "party of Cephas" and the "party of Christ," to say nothing of the party of Apollos, whose position is very difficult to grasp. The last group, however, can hardly have constituted a serious danger in view of the fact that the leader to whom they appeal is at the moment in S. Paul's company and on the friendliest possible terms with him (1 xvi. 12). It is hardly possible to suppose that the "party of Cephas" is not due to the activity of Jewish emissaries who regard S. Peter as their natural leader. Since, on the other hand, there is no trace of any desire on their part to advocate the imposition of the Law on Gentile converts, it is necessary to find out their motives for disparaging S. Paul's authority. The fact that his authority has been attacked is certain, and the attack comes from persons who are in some sense Apostles, and either claim to be his superiors in that capacity or else recognize other Apostles as superior both to themselves and S. Paul. It is natural to see in these persons Jewish Christians of note, who are witnesses of the Resurrection and call themselves Apostles in the wider sense in which S. Paul himself uses the word, but recognize the superiority of the Twelve (see Appendix on the Apostolate). Such persons would naturally have letters of recommendation from the Christians of Jerusalem. It was apparently the practice of the rulers of the Jews to send letters of commendation to be carried with them by prominent Jews on their travels (Acts xxviii. 21) and it is likely enough that the Christians should copy this practice. There is evidence that his critics have used against him the fact that his conduct does not come up to the standards of piety upheld at Jerusalem.

The solution seems to be that given in the text. The Corinthians have been visited by certain Jewish teachers who have been shocked at the scandals they have witnessed. They have urged the Corinthians to appeal to S. Peter, whom they regard as the chief of the Apostles and therefore responsible for supervising the development of all Christian Churches, to set matters right. In doing so they have disparaged S. Paul's authority. How far in doing so they were actuated by resentment against S. Paul on account of his victory over them at the Council of Jerusalem (for they are presumably members of the "party of circumcision," though they have abandoned its original programme), and how far it was due to the honest belief that the matters at issue were too important for S. Paul, whom they not unnaturally regard as an Apostle only in a secondary sense, to settle by himself, cannot be decided. We have only S. Paul's account of the matter written in the heat of controversy.

The main objection to the solution suggested lies in the passage 2 Cor. x. In the first eleven verses of that chapter S. Paul is replying to some opponent or group of opponents who accuse him of walking according to the flesh, and claim to be "of Christ." Here it is difficult to avoid the view that he is replying to attacks by the "party of Christ," who accuse him of "walking according to the flesh" on the ground that he condemns them for asserting the full liberty to which those who walk in the spirit are entitled. On the other hand, the latter part of the chapter seems to be an attack on the Jewish emissaries, who "commend themselves" and "boast in the labours of others." The next chapter deals with their charges and is devoted to their denial of his claim to be an Apostle in the fullest sense, and their claim to be as much Apostles as he is (note especially xi. 13 *seqq.*). There is thus a very abrupt transition from one group of opponents to another. The explanation is, however, to be found in iii. 1 *seqq.* Here S. Paul is replying to those of his opponents who have letters of commendation, who, as has been pointed out, are

apparently to be identified with the Jewish opposition. The words *ἀρχόμεθα πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνειν* are a reply to their charge that he is always commending himself, and thereby showing a lack of proper Christian humility. Similarly, in x. 11 (which we shall see reason to regard as part of an earlier letter, see § iv. n. 1), S. Paul feels that his assertion of his authority as against his antinomian opponents has led him into doing precisely what his Jewish opponents of the party of Cephas are attacking him for, namely, "commending himself," and he breaks off to deal with them. The transition is abrupt, but not more abrupt than that of 1 iv. 20–v. 2, where the word *πεφυσιωμένων* as applied to the failings of the Corinthians manifested in their divisions leads him off to the subject of their pride at the liberty revealed in the case of incest, with which he proceeds to deal. There is a similar transition in 1 vi. 9, where the allusion to *πόρνοι* in a list of sins leads him back to the subject of fornication, with which he was dealing before turning to the subject of lawsuits before Gentile courts at vi. 1. So too at 1 ix. 1 he diverges from the subject of *εἰδωλόθυτα* to an assertion of his authority, and thence at ix. 27 to the danger of final rejection, only returning at x. 14 to his main subject.

11. That these missionaries claimed in some sense to be Apostles is clear from 2 xi. 13, which is pointless unless the opponents to whom S. Paul refers claimed to be of that rank. For the nature of their position see Appendix on the Apostolate. That they accepted the decisions of the Council is to be presumed from the fact that S. Paul does not argue on the subject of the relation of the Gentiles to the Law, an omission which can only be explained by the fact that his opponents did not raise the question.

12. Cf. Jas ii. 1–9, iii. 13–15, iv. 1–4, 1 Peter ii. 18–21, and see above, c. 1. nn. 28 and 44, for the effect of this abuse on the Hebrew Christians.

The view that Christian disputes, where inevitable, should be decided in Christian courts followed inevitably from the view that Christians were the true Israelites. For the measure of recognition given to Jewish courts under the Roman Empire see above, c. vi. § v. n. 27. But naturally the Jews did not regard the validity of such courts as depending on Imperial recognition, but on the Law, and a devout Jew would submit to them whether their decisions were legal or not. Thus S. Paul allowed himself on five occasions to be beaten in the synagogue, a punishment to which in view of his rights as a Roman citizen he can hardly have been liable. Similarly, in Acts xxviii. 19, he apologizes to the Jews at Rome for the fact that he has appealed to Caesar. See on the whole subject *G.J.V.* III. 113 *seqq*. The fact that the Corinthians regarded it as natural to go to law in the ordinary courts is one of the signs of their mainly Gentile origin. The Gentile converts would naturally never dream of supposing that their profession of a new religion meant that they must submit to its decision in the affairs of their daily life.

13. The motive of the women in 1 Cor. xi. 2 is presumably their desire to assert their equality with men on the lines of S. Paul's own teaching in Gal. iii. 28. It is somewhat remarkable that the later Jewish practice, as laid down by the rabbinical authorities quoted in *Hor. Hebr.* on this passage, orders the veiling of men when praying or preaching in public, but allows women to remain unveiled in the synagogue. In the synagogues, however, women were segregated from men, and on normal occasions when, in public, they were bound to appear veiled. In heathen society it was also usual for women not to go out in public with their heads uncovered (cf. the references in Kirsopp Lake, *E.E.P.*, p. 210). Possibly the practice that women should appear with their heads covered at Christian worship was due to the fact that in the small places of worship available the separation of the sexes was impossible and therefore veiling was considered necessary, or possibly the practice was due to respect for the conventions of heathen society. It may, however, be questioned whether S. Paul is not merely enforcing an older practice of Judaism, and whether the rule that men should veil themselves when praying in public as a mark of their unworthiness to appear before God with their faces unveiled, and the relaxation of the obligation to do so in the case of women, are not of later origin. S. Paul's argument is typically rabbinical. Since woman was created for the sake of man, and is not free to do as she pleases, she must remain covered, in order that she may not show in public the beauty which belongs to man and is not hers to dispose of as she pleases. The argument is reinforced by the allusion

to the story of the angels who fell before the deluge, being attracted by the beauty of the daughters of men, especially the adornment of their hair (*Test. Reub.* v. 5, Tert. *De Virg. Veland.* vii; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 3). Apparently S. Paul himself feels that his argument is somewhat too much bound up with Jewish presuppositions, since he follows it up with the argument from the natural feeling that a woman should grow her hair long, while a man should keep it short, which is more calculated to impress the ordinary Gentile reader. In any case the main force of the passage lies in its rebuke of the self-assertiveness which characterized the Corinthians and was utterly inconsistent with the Christian spirit (*v.* 16). Both S. Paul and his Jewish opponents would be shocked by such self-assertion, the more so when it was manifested by women, and therefore peculiarly contrary to Jewish sentiments.

14. See Appendix on the Primitive Eucharist. It is to be remembered that the common meals, provided by the joint contributions of individual members, were intended to replace among the Gentiles the original communism of the Church of Jerusalem, which the circumstances of the Gentile converts made it impossible for them to practise. Naturally it would arouse among the Jewish Christians the worst possible interpretation if the Gentiles could not even live up to this very distant imitation of Christian poverty.

15. See Appendix on the Primitive Eucharist. It seems probable that the reason for the failure of the richer converts to appreciate the true nature of the common meal was their impatience to go on to its solemn eucharistic conclusion with the accompanying excitement of speaking with tongues and the display of other spiritual gifts (cf. *αλλήλους εκδέχεσθε* in 1 Cor. xi. 33). That the rich should be particularly to blame in this respect is natural, since it would be easier for them to arrive early than for the slaves and freedmen of the lower class who were dependent on their patrons. If the motive for their haste had merely been gluttony it is hard to see why they should not have acted on S. Paul's suggestion in *v.* 33 on their own initiative, and also to explain the absence of any general condemnation of the sin of gluttony in this whole passage.

16. It can hardly be doubted that S. Paul's criticisms in 1 Cor. xiv. 34 are aimed at women who speak at the formal meetings of the Church, *i.e.* mainly those held on Sunday for the Eucharist and for such other forms of worship as were practised by Gentiles who had never attended the synagogue (cf. c. v. § i. n. 21). The word *λαλείν* has lost its sense of "chattering" in N.T. Greek as is clear from its use in *vv.* 1–6, 19, where it is used of prophesying; consequently it is impossible to hold that S. Paul intends to forbid women to talk in Church; the prohibition clearly refers to public speaking. The order that they should be veiled when prophesying or praying (xi. 5) appears to refer to all meetings for public worship, when women would be present to pray, but not to prophesy, and also to informal gatherings of Christians when women would be allowed to speak. For such meetings cf. Acts xii. 12. It is to be presumed that it was at such meetings that the four daughters of Philip the Evangelist prophesied (Acts xxi. 9). It cannot be supposed that women were allowed to speak at the formal worship of the Church in Caesarea. Even if that body included any large number of Gentiles, which is in itself improbable (cf. c. III. § ii. n. 3 and c. IV. § ii. n. 6), it is incredible that so flagrant a defiance of all Jewish sentiment should have been permitted in a city where Jews and Gentiles lived in a state of continual hostility. The practice would have alienated completely any Jews in the city who might otherwise have been converted, and discredited the whole Christian body in Palestine. Hence it may be presumed that women were only allowed to prophesy at small informal gatherings. That they should be expected to veil themselves when doing so is natural, since it would offend both Jewish and Greek sentiment that they should appear before an audience, which might include strangers, without wearing a veil.

17. Cf. § i. n. 14.

18. Cf. § ii. n. 17. The account in the text is conjectural, but it is difficult to find any other explanation for the appearance of a party of Apollos. There can hardly have been any substantial difference between his outlook and that of S. Paul. It would be tempting to interpret 1 Cor. iv. 6 as meaning that in fact there was no party of Apollos, and that his name has been introduced merely by way of illustration in order to avoid slighting allusions to S. Peter as leader of the party of Cephas.

It seems however impossible to suppose that the party of Apollos is imaginary and the Cephas party real, and the verse apparently is intended to explain S. Paul's reason for confining himself from 1 Cor. iii. 3 to iv. 6 to the relative importance of himself and Apollos. It is noticeable that after 1 Cor. i. 12 he is careful to avoid the offence that might have been caused by a discussion of his position in relation to S. Peter, who only appears in the allusion in iii. 22. The explanation of the Apollos party given in the text appears to be consistent with the evidence, but that evidence is too defective to admit of any confidence as to its correctness.

19. See n. 10 and the Appendix on the Apostolate for the issues underlying this controversy in so far as the supporters of S. Peter are concerned.

20. 1 Cor. xv. 5 *seqq.*, where S. Paul both by his use of the ambiguous word ὤφθη and the phrase ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι admits that there was in fact some qualitative difference between his visions of Our Lord and the appearances which followed immediately after the Resurrection, which were normally regarded as constituting a claim to the Apostolate. Although he admits his inferiority to the rest of the Apostles in this respect, he will not admit that their superiority entitles them to interfere in his relations with his converts.

21. This is implied in the comparison in 2 Cor. xii. 1 *seqq.*

22. See above, § i. n. 27 and c. VI. § iii. n. 5 and § v. n. 13. It has been pointed out that S. Luke shows an obvious anxiety to dissociate the start of S. Paul's second journey from the mission of Silas and Judas to Antioch and that he also ignores the Apostolic colleague who accompanies S. Paul on his third journey. It is clear that S. Paul's whole position as an Apostle has been attacked at Corinth. It is natural to suppose that the way in which S. Luke deals with the opening of the second journey is a reply to those who endeavoured to represent it as originating merely as an extension to Cilicia and Galatia of the mission of Silas and Judas to Antioch. With the handing of the decrees to the Churches of Galatia S. Paul's Apostolic authority had, it might be argued, come to an end; he was in the same position as Philip the Evangelist at Samaria. The misrepresentation would be easy, and might even be the result of genuine misunderstanding.

23. 1 Cor. ix. 4 *seqq.*, 2 xi. 7 *seqq.*, xii. 13 *seqq.*

24. See § i. n. 30. That S. Peter had already left Palestine can of course only be conjectured. In any case he could not be reached without considerable delay.

25. That the "Christ-party" is to be identified with the party that claims complete license in respect to moral conduct seems almost certain. It is the title which would naturally be adopted by those who based their claims on a distortion of such Pauline teaching as that of Gal. iii. 23 *seqq.*, v. 1, Ro. viii. 1 *seqq.* Further, it is implied in 2 Cor. x. 1–11 that the opponent against whom S. Paul is writing claims to be "of Christ," and accuses S. Paul of walking after the flesh (*vv.* 7 and 3). Thus it is clear that S. Paul in writing 2 Cor. x has to deal with opponents who criticize him as being too much bound by earthly considerations and not taking a really spiritual view. These people claim to be "of Christ" and it is difficult to suppose that they are not the "Christ-party" of the earlier letter. For the abrupt transition from these opponents to his Jewish critics in 2 Cor. x. 12 see above, n. 10 *ad fin.*

26. Here again the course of events can only be conjectured from the situation implied in the Epistles. At the time when 1 Cor. is written we have a party which favours the complete rejection of all moral restraint and is large enough for S. Paul to write about it as though it were the whole Corinthian Church (v. 2). We have a section loyal to S. Paul, represented by "those of Chloe" and the persons mentioned in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 *seqq.*, of whom of course Fortunatus and Achaicus may be the same as "those of Chloe." We have also the Jewish opponents and the party of Apollos. Assuming that the attitude of these four groups is that already described, we have to explain the fact that although apparently three out of the four groups are perfectly orthodox in their views as to Christian morality, yet they are incapable of enforcing their views on the rest of the Church. This would indeed be capable of explanation on the ground that the antinomian section held a large predominance over the other groups in the Church, were it not for the fact that no one has made any general appeal to S. Paul to deal with the moral crisis involved by the attitude of this section. A letter has been written to him at an earlier date, asking his advice as to the attitude to be adopted towards fornicators, but his reply has remained

ineffective. A further letter has then been written to which 1 Cor. is a reply. This letter said nothing of the moral difficulties of the Corinthian Church, but only dealt with the subjects discussed in cc. vii–x (cf. n. 32 below for the view that xi. 2 is a reply to the end of the letter from Corinth). The remainder of the difficulties have only been made known to him by hearsay, presumably by "those of Chloe." Thus we have a situation in which S. Paul has in fact been consulted on certain points, but not on the points which he (and presumably the Corinthians also) regards as the most important. This is intelligible if the points raised in the letter of the Corinthians to which 1 Cor. is a reply are difficulties arising out of his own teaching on the occasion of his mission at Corinth, on which some of his converts desire fuller information, while the more serious issues have been ignored until the Corinthians can decide who is the proper authority to appeal to for a general regulation of the affairs of the Church in respect of these matters. It is very difficult to discover any other explanation which suits the evidence.

It may seem remarkable that questions of authority should have been so hotly disputed at Corinth at this period in the development of the Church as to render it impossible to deal effectively with a complete abandonment of the moral standards of Christianity. On the other hand, it is clear on any explanation that one of the main issues in the Corinthian disputes is that of S. Paul's authority, since it is to this matter that 1 iii and iv, ix. 1–23, 2 v. 11–vi. 10, x. 12–xiii. 10, are devoted. It is to be remembered that the parties to the dispute were largely Jews, and members of the nation which a few years later was engaged in carrying on a series of civil wars during the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans. In Christian history the situation is not dissimilar to that of the fifteenth century when the abuses which led to the Reformation were deplored on all sides but the debates as to the proper source of ecclesiastical authority rendered an internal reformation impossible. There is no evidence that S. Peter or any others of the Twelve supported the action of their partisans at Corinth.

27. For the issues underlying 1 Cor. vii cf. Goudge's commentary *ad loc.*

28. Cf. Goudge on 1 Cor. viii *seqq.*

29. The word οἴδαμεν in viii. 1 and 4 takes up the arguments used in the letter of the Corinthians, whether those of the writers of the letter themselves or of others whom they quote. The argument that external participation in idol-worship cannot do any harm since an idol is a nonentity is a logical deduction from the common Jewish criticism of idol-worship (cf. c. iv. § i. n. 13). S. Paul finds it wise to reinforce his arguments on the subject by introducing at x. 20 the other Jewish view that the objects of heathen worship are evil spirits.

30. The exact heresy as to the Resurrection which S. Paul combats in 1 Cor. xv is very difficult to ascertain. His arguments would tell most directly against a complete denial of any future life at all, but it is very difficult to understand the position of persons who professed Christianity but denied any future life, in view of the importance of eschatological teaching involving the final and eternal triumph of God's people in all contemporary Christian and Jewish thought. That he is arguing against a belief in the immortality of the soul as against a bodily resurrection is hardly possible. In that case he would almost inevitably emphasize the fact that the Resurrection of Our Lord was a bodily resurrection, whereas the wording of xv. 1–23 only commits him to teaching the fact that Our Lord reappeared after death and proved His continued existence; but nothing is said as to His bodily resurrection. This absence of any emphasis on the fact that the Resurrection of Our Lord was a bodily resurrection seems fatal to the view that S. Paul has in mind opponents who are endeavouring to substitute the immortality of the soul for the resurrection of the body. Moreover, it may be doubted whether the Corinthians would have appreciated the somewhat subtle distinction between a belief in personal immortality and belief in a bodily resurrection, which was not, however, a resurrection of flesh and blood.

Consequently it would seem that the error involved is a somewhat more elaborate form of that dealt with in 1 Thess. iv. 13. What S. Paul's opponents deny is not the eternal life of those who survive until the Second Coming of Our Lord, but the resurrection of those who die before it. This would also seem to be the error of Hymenaeus and Philetus in 2 Tim. ii. 17, that the resurrection is already past.

In other words the resurrection of the Christian has taken place at his baptism, and is to be completed at the return of the Lord. This being still regarded as imminent, it was natural that the question of the fate of those who died before it should not at first be considered; when the question arose it is natural that some of S. Paul's converts should fall into the error of supposing that their death was a proof of their unworthiness to share in the glory of the Second Coming (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 30). The belief that the resurrection of the Christian is already past and only waits its completion is a not unnatural interpretation of such Pauline teaching as Ro. vi. 2–12, vii. 4–6, viii. 9–11, 18 *seqq.* It is an error originating in an atmosphere of intense expectation of the Second Coming and a rather over-literal interpretation of S. Paul's use of the metaphor of a death to sin and a risen life in Christ to describe the effect of conversion and baptism. For a similar difficulty in contemporary Jewish apocalyptic writers cf. 4 Esdr. v. 41 *seqq.*

31. S. Paul's whole treatment of the subject of εἰδωλόθυτα and his failure to refer to the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem form of course one of the main problems of Pauline history. Whatever text of those decrees is followed, and whether their original intention was to provide a food-law or a moral code for Gentile converts, it is clear that they prohibit the eating of meats offered to idols in the sense of 1 Cor. viii. 10 and x. 28, while to Jewish minds it would probably condemn the practice in the sense of 1 Cor. x. 25. In a city of the size of Corinth the Jews would have butchers of their own, from whom, a Jewish Christian would argue, all Christians should buy. Since any meat in the market might be polluted by having been offered to idols, it is to be presumed that the Jews made arrangements to provide their own meat (cf. *'Aboda Zara* ii. 3).

It is possible that S. Paul's treatment of the subject is due to his doubts whether the Gentiles of Corinth could in any case be persuaded to do more than observe the spirit of the decrees. Those decrees had been framed in the first instance for Christians in Syria and Cilicia, including Galatia. Those converts were mainly Jewish in origin or else Gentiles who had already been influenced by Judaism to some extent before their conversion. Consequently it would not be hard to persuade them to obey decrees which only represented a standard of practice which the majority of them had already been observing. The decrees would also be more needed where the Church included a large Jewish element, since any failure to keep them might result in a withdrawal of Jewish Christians from the common meals of the Church.

On the other hand, this explanation leaves untouched the almost equal difficulty of explaining the circumstances in which the Corinthians wrote to S. Paul the letter to which 1 Cor. is an answer. The questions as to meats offered to idols and celibacy cannot emanate from the purely antinomian party. They appear to be the result of a conflict between a group which stands for rigid asceticism and another which stands for a reasonable degree of freedom in moral questions. Thus both groups are generally loyal to S. Paul's teaching. But these groups would inevitably oppose the immoralities of the antinomian section, even if they had not grasped the necessity of abstaining from Gentile law-courts, or the need for order in public worship. It is difficult to suppose that they denied the resurrection. Yet on these matters they have not appealed for S. Paul's guidance. The explanation advanced in the text can only be regarded as a conjecture, but it has at least the merit of explaining both the reason for an appeal to S. Paul on the subject of εἰδωλόθυτα and the nature of his answer. Assuming that the reason for the failure of the loyal party at Corinth to appeal to S. Paul is the fact that other Christians equally orthodox in matters of morality demand an appeal to S. Peter, it is by no means inconceivable that the Jewish missionaries who favoured the latter course should be willing that an appeal should be sent to S. Paul for a clear statement of his teaching on certain points, when one of the points concerned could hardly be settled without a reference to the Council of Jerusalem. Any such reference could be interpreted as proving that S. Paul himself recognized the superior authority of the Church of Judaea and therefore of S. Peter, its head. It also explains why S. Paul, having heard from "those of Chloe" the true state of affairs at Corinth, of which, so far as the writers knew, he was ignorant, should ignore the Council and settle the question of εἰδωλόθυτα by an appeal to first principles.

32. The sarcastic praise of 1 Cor. xi. 2 can hardly be anything but a reference to professions of loyalty standing at the end of the Corinthian letter to which S. Paul is replying. He proceeds to two scandals in the Corinthian community which obviously have been made known to him by some of his friends at Corinth, not in the official letter of the community.

33. Cf. § ii. n. 1. The allusion to Pentecost suggests that it is not very far off, while the language of v. 6 *seqq.* would seem to be inspired by the fact that Easter is being kept at the time when S. Paul writes or is just over. It is possible that the length to which the disorders at Corinth have grown at the time when S. Paul writes is due to the fact that they began with the departure of the Roman converts during the late autumn of the preceding year, and developed during the winter when S. Paul at Ephesus was cut off from events on the other side of the Aegean. Otherwise it is hard to understand why S. Paul should not have intervened before matters had reached the pitch implied in 1 Cor.

34. 1 Cor. xi. 16, xiv. 33 *seqq.* In both cases we have an appeal to the authority of Christian practice elsewhere, but in both cases it is introduced in such a manner as to admit nothing as to the superiority of the rulers of such bodies to S. Paul himself.

35. See n. 18 above. The care with which reference to S. Peter is avoided in the passage 1 Cor. iii. 3–iv. 14, except for the single allusion in iii. 22, and the fact that S. Paul deliberately transfers the argument to himself and Apollos (iv. 6), are clearly intended to avoid giving offence ("in order that ye may learn in us, without introducing others into the discussion"). Similarly, in vii. 7, 8, he expresses fairly clearly his own belief that it is better for the Christian not to marry, but at ix. 5 he avoids any criticism of the older Apostles. It is instructive to note the difference between S. Paul's method of dealing with S. Peter here and the language of Gal. ii. 6. The difference tells somewhat strongly in favour of the view that Galatians was written some time before 1 Cor. and that the issues dealt with in it are entirely settled by the time that the later Epistle is written. Otherwise there seems no reason for the difference in the way in which S. Paul alludes to the older Apostles in the two letters.

36. See preceding note. He admits the superiority of others as witnesses of the Resurrection in 1 xv. 9, but is careful to claim that the results of his labours, or rather of the grace of God working through him, are such as to give him a rank in the Apostolate equal to that of any of the others.

37. The general drift of 1 Cor. xv is that the Resurrection of Our Lord, a fact which is guaranteed by the most ample testimony of human beings still alive and accessible, is meaningless except as a guarantee of the resurrection of the dead. Christ, as the firstfruits of the dead, will at the end bring with Him the dead and then establish the Kingdom and deliver it up to the Father. The last act in the process will be the destruction of death by which those then living will be delivered from it. Apart from the absurdity of supposing that those who fall asleep in Christ are lost, the practice of baptism for the dead proves the belief of all Christians in the possibility of the resurrection. So does S. Paul's own practice. It would not be worth his while to risk his life daily if there were no resurrection for him in the event of his losing it. The inconceivability of a resurrection of the body is refuted by the analogy of nature, which proves that the same thing may have different bodies. This is followed by an argument of the Philonic type. The first Adam was a spiritual being first, and only became subsequently a living soul, *i.e.* a spirit united to the lower elements of the natural soul and also to a material body (cf. Philo, *De Mundi Opif.* 46 (M. 1. 32)). In Philo, however, the soul is merely an emanation of the divine spirit, whereas to S. Paul Adam is a spiritual being who becomes a "living soul." The fact that he was a spiritual being at the time when he was made into a living soul proves the possibility of the existence of a man in a purely spiritual state. This state of affairs will be restored at the Second Coming, when Christ, as the heavenly man, who is the image of God, will appear. Then flesh and blood, *i.e.* the human body in the conditions in which we know it, will come to an end, whether we are alive at the moment or not. In either case we shall undergo the mysterious change which is necessary to enable corruption to put on incorruption. This argument is, of course, a conclusive reply to S. Paul's

opponents, if they held the view that those alive at the Second Coming would receive an eternal reward then, but that those who die first would not, since it is in fact just as difficult to conceive of a transformation of the living into an incorruptible state as to conceive of a resurrection of the dead.

For S. Paul's language in this passage cf. c. IV. § i. Appendices.

The practice of "baptism for the dead" can hardly be anything but that described by Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* v. 10, of vicarious baptism on behalf of dead friends or relations, presumably those who had shown at least some prospect of conversion before their death. The practice as described by Tertullian is of course heretical, but it would seem to be a survival of what was once regarded as orthodox.

38. See below, § iv. n. 3. The words ὥσπερ διέταξα in 1 xvi. 1 show that S. Paul did not at the moment realize how far opposition to his authority had gone at Corinth, and he apologizes for them in 2 Cor. viii. 8 (οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω).

§ iv. THE VICTORY AT CORINTH

The letter failed completely to produce the effect which Paul had anticipated[1]. He had underrated the strength of his opponents and they rejected with vigour his claim to regulate their life as Christians. The leader of the "party of Christ" encouraged his followers to persist by denouncing Paul himself as still "walking in the flesh" and unable to grasp the spiritual significance of the Gospel he had preached. His letter was derided as an attempt to produce an impression of personal strength and dignity, which he knew he would be unable to sustain in a personal meeting with his opponents[2]. Nor, it was urged, had he any right to issue orders to the Corinthian community as to the collection for the Saints. If the Corinthians chose to exercise their liberality towards the Christians of Palestine, it was entirely a matter for their own discretion what they gave, or how they chose to organize their donation[3]. The suspicion was expressed that Paul's previous refusal to accept support from his converts at Corinth was a mere pretext for exacting larger sums at a later date on the score of the alleged collection, which, it was hinted, might very well fail to find its way to those for whom it was destined[4].

Nor were Paul's Jewish opponents less vigorous in their opposition. His whole letter was an attempt to exercise an authority to which he had not the smallest claim. Whatever right he might possess to the title of an Apostle—and his refusal to accept the support of his converts showed that on the occasion of his visit he had scruples on the matter himself—they possessed in an equal degree. They were, whether as Jews or as Christians, his equals in the faith, to say the least of it. They made no claim that it fell within their province to deal with the affairs of the Corinthians; all they urged was that the whole matter should be referred to those who had the claim to be

called Apostles in the strictest sense. Their own authority was guaranteed by the letters of commendation which they could show from those whom Paul himself appealed to as the witnesses of the doctrines which he preached, while he himself could show no such proof of his authority[5].

Such was the account of their reception which Paul's messengers brought on rejoining him at Ephesus. It was manifest that his letter had only intensified the existing divisions and given the antinomian party opportunities for extending their influence. Paul decided on a personal visit to Corinth, to be paid immediately without waiting for the end of his mission to Ephesus. Communications between the two cities were easy in the sailing season and a very short period would be needed for a flying visit and a return to Asia[6]. Unfortunately the decision proved to be disastrous. Paul's arrival failed to overawe his opponents, who advanced to his face those objections which they had previously urged in his absence. Those objections were of a sufficiently personal character to lead to painful scenes of altercation. The fact of the visit and the plans which he announced in the course of it gave indeed a fresh handle to one group of his opponents. Trusting at the outset in an easy victory, he notified his intention of paying a further visit to Corinth shortly and proceeding through Corinth to Macedonia, returning thence to the city on his way to Jerusalem[7]. This was in itself a fresh ground of offence to his Jewish rivals. It was entirely contrary to their conception of the Christian character to announce light-heartedly such sweeping changes of plan, especially without expressing with suitable reverence a recognition that all these plans were dependent on the will of God for their fulfilment. Nor again were the vigorous and redundant asseverations with which Paul supported his arguments in harmony with their view of the Christian character, which did not tolerate more than the plainest and most sober statement of facts and rejected as blasphemous any addition to it in the way of adjuration[8].

The result was that the visit terminated in an intensification of the whole controversy, while in the course of it Paul's leading opponent among the antinomians offered him a grievous personal insult[9]. Paul could only retire defeated, since his enemies showed no signs of yielding and had too large a following to be ignored. None the less he could not allow them to win the day. He must of necessity vindicate his authority by the expulsion from the Corinthian Church of all who refused to submit to his authority. In effect this amounted to issuing an order to his more faithful followers to form a separate

community from which at least two large sections of the existing Church would be cut off. The course, however, was not one on which he could venture without taking every possible step to avert a disaster which would involve the loss of so large a body of Christians. Apart from this it would mean a very serious danger to the success of the collection, on which so much depended, if he had to reduce the Corinthian Church from one of the largest Gentile communities to a mere remnant of those who were loyal to himself. Moreover, such an action would inevitably involve a fresh controversy with the Hebrew Christians, who could hardly fail to hear of his action and would naturally support the Jewish teachers and their followers against him. Thus on his return to Ephesus Paul decided on a last effort to retrieve what seemed a hopeless situation. He wrote a violent letter, answering the charges of his critics, and threatening a further visit, the object of which would be the expulsion from the Church of all who continued their opposition[10]. The letter was sent by Titus, in spite of the fact that he was doubtful of its wisdom—a doubt which its violence did much to justify[11]. Paul, however, was determined on his ultimatum and despatched his messenger with assurances of a success of which he was in fact far from confident; and subsequent reflection only increased his anxiety as to the probable effect of the course of action to which he had committed himself by his letter[12].

Even if he succeeded in subduing the opposition at Corinth the position had already been seriously complicated by the disorders in that city. Originally the Corinthians had taken up the proposal for the collection for the Christians of Jerusalem with the utmost enthusiasm. But that outburst had resulted in little more than vague promises[13], and Paul had already felt it necessary to stimulate fresh interest in the scheme by promising to act himself as one of the delegates of the Corinthians, in the event of a sufficient sum being raised. Thus, in the event of failure in his dealings with the Corinthian opposition, he had to face the prospect of a very serious reduction of the amount he had hoped to send to Jerusalem as the result of his work among the Gentiles, while in the event of success he was bound to pay a personal visit to the city[14]. This was a somewhat serious matter. He had already conceived the possibility of abandoning the personal supervision of the communities he had founded and extending his labours to a new field. The prophets had foretold the time when the true faith should be established from the rising of the sun to its going down, and he hoped to see that prophecy fulfilled in a

journey which should take him to Rome, the capital of the world, and thence to Spain, the furthest limit of the West[15]. But it was difficult to expect that any visit which he might make to Jerusalem would enjoy the same immunity from persecution as those of the past. He had already many enemies there and his present activities in Asia had added to them the official rulers of the city. The growth of lawlessness in Judaea made it easier for them to get rid of him in spite of the protection which he could hope to find from his fellow-Pharisees. A fresh visit to Jerusalem might well mean the end of all his hopes[16].

None the less his promise to the Corinthians must be fulfilled if he succeeded in his last attempt to bring them to their senses; and his decision to risk the visit was confirmed by that sense of supernatural constraint which he regarded as the mark of divine inspiration[17]. In any case a visit to Macedonia was necessary in order to carry out the final arrangements of the collection and also to enable Paul to renew his acquaintance with the converts whom he had seen on his first journey through Macedonia only for the briefest of periods. In the event of success in his final effort to regain the allegiance of the Corinthians a further visit to Achaea would also be necessary. Timothy accompanied by Erastus had already been sent on in advance to Macedonia to prepare for this visit, but Paul had not finally decided on its date when Titus was despatched to Corinth. He had, however, fixed his plans sufficiently to order Titus not to return direct to Ephesus but to travel by the overland route to meet him at Troas[18].

At this point, however, a fresh complication arose. Paul's labours among the Gentiles had hitherto failed to assume sufficient proportions to attract the hostility of any organized religious body but the synagogue. The duration of his stay at Ephesus had, however, enabled him to appeal to those who had never been brought under Jewish influences to an extent which made the new faith a serious competitor to the long-established cults of the Gentiles. The result was a serious diminution in the demand for objects of piety connected with the cult of the Ephesian Artemis, and a consequent decline in the revenues of those whose living depended on the sale of such objects[19]. They could hardly allow the propagation of the new creed to continue unchecked. This constituted a new danger, far more serious than any which Paul had hitherto been called on to face. He had found means of avoiding the old dangers of Jewish hostility by concentrating his energies on the centres of Roman government, where the superior

officials refused to investigate Jewish quarrels and were above the reach of those forms of pressure by which the magistrates of smaller cities had been persuaded to proceed against him without investigating the questions at issue between himself and the rest of the nation. At Ephesus in particular he was safeguarded by the friendship of some members of the highest class of heathen society[20], who, although not converts to the new faith, were none the less attracted by it and in sympathy with its teaching. But however sympathetic they might be, they could hardly defend him against serious attacks from the new quarter. The magistrates of the city would not dare to defend a new religion which openly attacked the local cult[21]. So long as it merely influenced a small circle and was indistinguishable, except to the expert, from the tolerated system of the synagogue, they would be perfectly complacent, but they would certainly not defend it against local public opinion: indeed they were likely to be as fanatical as any of the citizens in their zeal for the honour of the goddess of Ephesus. Even a proconsular court would hesitate to defend Paul in such a matter.

His mission at Ephesus was already drawing to a close when a sudden wave of conversions occurred, as a result of which the new opposition burst into flame[22]. One of the leading employers of labour in the trade of manufacturing silver emblems of the Ephesian Artemis stimulated the craftsmen into a violent riot against the new creed which threatened equally their craft and the honour of the goddess. The rioters, supported by the bulk of the population of the city, filled the theatre with a disorderly mob, which resolved itself into a vigorous demonstration of loyalty to the local deity. Paul himself was anxious to enter the theatre and use the occasion for addressing the crowd, a step which must inevitably have involved him in the gravest personal danger in view of the excited state of public feeling; but his disciples, supported by the influence of his friends among the Asiarchs, succeeded in restraining him. Gaius and Aristarchus, two of his companions, were actually seized by the populace and dragged into the theatre, but succeeded in escaping without any serious personal injury. Meanwhile the orthodox Jews endeavoured to take advantage of the riot to dissociate themselves in the eyes of the general public from the unpopularity of the new teaching, which could hardly fail to react unfavourably on the synagogue. Naturally, however, the crowd was hardly in the temper to listen to a disquisition on the relations of the teachings of Christianity and Judaism, or to distinguish from Christianity a cult which was just as hostile to the honour of the goddess. The Jews of Asia were generally unpopular among their

neighbours[23], and so soon as the mob realized that Alexander, the speaker put forward by the Jews, was a member of that nation he was refused a hearing, and the uproar was renewed. Finally the clerk of the city quelled the tumult[24], pointing out that Paul and his followers were guilty neither of sacrilege—a favourite charge against the Jews[25]—nor of provocative attacks on the honour of Artemis. He warned them that their action might involve the city in serious troubles with the Imperial authorities, which were not likely to regard with favour such disorderly proceedings, especially when it was impossible to give any satisfactory explanation of their origin. The result might well be a serious blow to the position of the city in the Empire, or at least to its prestige as the leading city of Asia. He added that any genuine complaint could be referred to the proconsul or to a lawful and regular assembly of the citizens[26]. In view of his warning the meeting broke up peaceably.

Although, however, Paul was thus out of immediate danger, it was clearly unsafe for him to remain in Ephesus, or to make it the centre of any further activity on a large scale. The riot might at any moment break out afresh, and even if it did not, the hostility of Demetrius and his fellows could easily find means of making itself felt in a more dangerous form[27]. Although he could probably continue to reside in the city and supervise the growth of the Asiatic communities, he could not venture to preach the Gospel there to the Gentile world at large. His plans for using Ephesus as the centre for assembling his delegates with their contributions for Jerusalem were rendered hazardous by his new notoriety; Jewish collections had suffered in the past from illegal attacks by the Gentiles, and it was likely that his own would be endangered[28].

The effect of this new blow, when added to his anxiety as to the course which events might be taking at Corinth, plunged Paul into a state of the deepest depression and despondency[29]. Almost in despair he left Ephesus for Troas, intending to wait there for Titus[30]. While doing so he could take the opportunity of evangelizing a city which was a valuable strategic point for the diffusion of the Gospel and also a convenient half-way house for converts from Churches already founded, when journeying between Asia and Macedonia[31]. Paul had actually opened his mission and the prospects of success were favourable; but Titus did not arrive and his anxiety was too great to allow him to continue his work. He left behind his little handful of converts and pressed forward to meet his messenger from Corinth at an earlier stage of his journey[32].

At some point in Macedonia the meeting was effected. Paul found to his relief that the ultimatum to the Corinthians had been a complete success[33]. The opposition of the Corinthians had collapsed in face of his threats and the only danger to be apprehended was that the main body of the community in their sudden revulsion of feeling should display an undue measure of severity to the leaders of the opposition[34]. The Jewish teachers, alarmed by the mischief they had wrought, had retired from Corinth, leaving the community to deal with the antinomian difficulties under Paul's direction[35]. The news of the success produced in him a characteristic reaction from the despondency which had driven him to abandon his work at Troas to the utmost enthusiasm. He wrote a letter immediately to express his joy at the decision of the Corinthians and at the same time to plead on behalf of the leader of the party of Christ, who had offered him the gravest personal insult on the occasion of his unsuccessful visit, and to deprecate any undue severity in dealing with him. At the same time it was wise to use the outburst of enthusiasm for the benefit of the collection for the Saints which had hitherto been allowed to fall into the background as a result of the disputes of the Corinthians. In dealing with this matter he reminded them of their former readiness to take up the proposal, informing them that he was using that readiness as a means of stimulating the generosity of the Christians of Macedonia. Incidentally he used the fact that the Macedonians were displaying a characteristic liberality in contributing in order to stimulate a new and more practical enthusiasm at Corinth[36]. At the same time he withdrew the implication of his former letter that he had the right to give orders to his converts to contribute and explained carefully that the matter was one for their own free choice[37]. Nor did he fail to emphasize strongly the claims of the Hebrew Christians on the generosity of the Gentiles, the exalted nature of the motives which imposed on the Christian the duty of liberality, and the high rewards to be obtained by it[38]. To increase the impression which his appeal was intended to make and as a compliment to the importance of the Corinthians, he entrusted the letter to Titus, the emissary who had won such distinction in settling the troubles of the community, and his own Apostolic colleague, together with another of the most prominent Christians among his immediate personal followers[39]. The choice of delegates of such distinction could hardly fail to quell any lingering elements of opposition, and also, since his colleague had been appointed by the Churches of Palestine particularly for the purpose of assisting in the supervision

of the collection, to remove any suspicion that might have arisen as to his own personal integrity, a point of some importance in view of the insinuations of his opponents at an earlier stage of the controversy[40]. For the rest his letter was a paean of triumph over the repentance of the Corinthians, intended to remove from their minds the errors of the past months, including any lingering tendency to trifle either with the temptation, natural to those who had come to Christianity through the synagogue, to reverence anything of Jewish origin as being in some way a higher form of Christianity, or with the attractiveness of those antinomian views which sought to lessen the gulf between the Christian and the heathen society which he had left behind[41]. Having despatched his letter Paul was free to proceed with the visitation of the Macedonian Churches. At the completion of this work he went on to Corinth, arriving there towards the end of the autumn[42].

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII, SECTION IV

1. The history of S. Paul's relations with his converts at Corinth after the writing of 1 Cor. depends on the relation of the section 2 Cor. x–end to the rest of the letter. That section in its present position in the N.T. is entirely inexplicable. S. Paul has just finished the subject of the collection for the Saints in a passage which follows naturally on the earlier part of the letter, which congratulates the Corinthians on abandoning their rebellion against himself. The closing section is, however, entirely incompatible with the earlier part. It is violently controversial in tone and is devoted to the attacks of opponents, one group of whom deride him as lacking both in a true understanding of the spiritual meaning of Christianity and also in personal weight, while the other group claim to be his equals, if not his superiors, in standing in the Church. At the same time there is no hint that at x. 1 he is addressing a different body of people from those to whom the earlier part of the letter has been addressed, such as we have in Ro. xi. 13 when he passes from the Jewish section of the Roman Church to the Gentiles. It is true that S. Paul appears to pass without distinct notice from one group of opponents to another on various occasions, notably at x. 12 (see above, § iii. n. 10), but here we have to assume a transition from a loyal majority to a rebellious minority, with no indication that any such transition is taking place. The only explanation would be that the letter was intended to be read at a meeting of the Corinthian Church and that the reader, possibly Titus, had received directions which would enable him to make the transition clear by his manner of delivery. A "stage-direction" of this kind seems to be implied in Phil. iv. 3 to enable the reader of the letter to turn to some particular person who is addressed.

This solution, however, does not suit the actual text of this section of the Epistle. The wording of xii. 20–xiii implies that S. Paul is dealing not with a small fraction of rebellious Corinthians but with a large body of opponents, which may include practically the whole community. On the other hand, it appears from ii. 6 that the majority are loyal to S. Paul and anxious to punish the offender who has done him the most grievous injury. Further, unless the opponent of ii. 6 is a different opponent from those to whom he is replying in the closing section of the Epistle, it is difficult to see how S. Paul can write in one place asking for leniency towards him, and in another threatening him with punishment, in the event of his refusing to submit.

Thus the letter as it now stands seems to contradict itself. Further, we have in ii. 3–4 allusions to a letter written in affliction and oppression of heart and with many tears, which has been sent to Corinth in order to avoid the pain of a second

visit of an unpleasant character, demanding apparently the punishment of some offender. The description will not suit 1 Cor., which in spite of the fact that it contains some severe reflections on the condition of affairs at Corinth, could not without gross exaggeration be described as S. Paul describes his letter in ii. 4. On the other hand the description is perfectly suited to the closing section of 2 Cor. as we possess it.

Further there are several passages in the earlier part of the Epistle which read remarkably like references to passages in the closing section, presupposing a knowledge of its contents in S. Paul's readers. They are as follows:

2 i. 23 with an apparent reference to 2 xiii. 2.
2 ii. 3 „ „ „ 2 xiii. 10.
2 ii. 9 „ „ „ 2 x. 6 and xiii. 3 *seqq.*

For these reasons, which are fully stated together with certain subsidiary ones by Kirsopp Lake in *E.E.P.* 154 *seqq.*, it seems probable that we have in the current text of 2 Cor. fragments of two separate Epistles, the section which at present stands at the end being in fact part of the earlier Epistle. It is certainly not the whole of it, since the letter which produced the effect described in 2 vii. 8 *seqq.* was largely directed to a demand for the punishment of some individual offender (*v.* 12). The main objection to this view is, of course, the fact that there is no evidence that any other version of the Epistle ever existed than that which we now possess, as there is in the case of Romans. It is very difficult to justify the dislocation of a document with no MS. evidence to support the proceeding. On the other hand, it may be noted that there is a possible explanation of the process. It would seem from 2 ii. 6 that the offender had repented of his attitude towards S. Paul at the time when this part of the letter was written. Clearly S. Paul would not plead for him, if he remained impenitent. It is clear that there was a letter from S. Paul to the Corinthians demanding his summary punishment and dealing with him personally. It is this passage, which on the theory suggested formed the opening part of the letter, the end of which has survived as 2 Cor. x. 1–end. Since this passage was purely personal it might well seem unnecessary to preserve it, just as the purely personal passage at the end of Romans is omitted in some MSS. (c. VIII. § i. n. 24). This would particularly be the case if the passage was of a peculiarly painful character, dealing with the offences of a Corinthian convert who had once enjoyed a considerable position in the community, and had subsequently expressed regret for his action. We have no means of saying how far S. Paul's letters were regarded at the time as being worthy of permanent preservation; but if they were so regarded, it is quite conceivable that S. Paul himself suggested the destruction of a passage which had no permanent value and none but unpleasant associations. In this case the opening verses of c. x are the conclusion of S. Paul's answer to the offender, preserved as necessary on account of the fact that they lead up to his reply to his Jewish opponents. This he would regard as of permanent importance, since he could not tell that other Jewish Christians might not appear at Corinth advocating similar views as to his Apostolate. It is to be remembered that this controversy has affected the narrative of the Acts, and was therefore still a living memory when S. Luke wrote long after S. Paul's last recorded visit to Corinth. Thus it is fairly easy to account for the mutilation of the letter and the preservation of its conclusion only. It would appear that a termination of S. Paul's last known letter to Corinth (*i.e.* on the supposition advanced above, 2 Cor. i–ix inclusive) has dropped out, but it is quite possible that this merely consisted of a series of personal greetings similar to the termination of Romans, or a formal doxology.

It must be admitted that this dislocation of the letter is very difficult, but on the other hand it is impossible to find any other explanation of the complete contrast in the tone of the two parts of the Epistle. If the dislocation be admitted we get a clear and consistent picture of the course of events at Corinth; without it we have nothing but confusion.

2. 2 Cor. x. 3–11. It can hardly be doubted that these arguments proceed from an opponent who claims to be an upholder of the true liberty of the Christian who walks in the spirit of Christ, as against the attempt of S. Paul to preserve the old carnal element of the Law.

3. 2 Cor. viii. 8, and cf. § iii. n. 38. It seems fairly clear that the later passage is intended to allay any irritation which the former may inadvertently have caused. S. Paul would hardly think it necessary to take such precautions, if his earlier wording had not been used by his enemies to stir up disaffection. Such an attempt can only be supposed to proceed from the party of Christ, as it is impossible that the Jewish teachers should have any desire to interfere with the success of the collection for their brethren in Palestine.

4. 2 Cor. viii. 20, xii. 16, in which S. Paul appears to be answering charges against his personal integrity in the matter. The former passage indeed may only refer to his desire in the choice of a colleague to secure one who would be a guarantee of his good faith (see § i. n. 27). There seems, however, no reason for his reference to the point unless the objection had actually been raised at Corinth. The latter passage refers to an actual charge, apparently arising out of the argument used by his Jewish opponents that he is no Apostle because he does not accept support from his converts. To this S. Paul has already replied in 1 Cor. ix. 1–18. Here, however, he appears to be replying to a further charge, that although he had not asked for support his refusal to do so was a piece of deception, intended to enable him to obtain larger sums from the Corinthians later on. It seems probable that this objection is associated with the opposition of the party of Christ to the collection, as it is hard to find any other occasion for it. But the explanation can only be a conjecture.

5. 2 Cor. xi. 12–xii. 14 (cf. § iii. n. 10). To the charge of self-commendation S. Paul replies by retorting that he does not try, as his critics are trying, to win a reputation by interfering in the labours of others. By "self-commendation" is meant claiming an Apostolic authority which he does not possess, and which he tacitly admitted he had no claim to by refusing support at Corinth, whereas the Apostles *par excellence* had always accepted it in Palestine. It has also been urged that he is of comparative unimportance in the Church. His opponents have compared him unfavourably with themselves and therefore *a fortiori* with the Twelve. It is of interest to observe that while his opponents are ministers of Christ, yet they base a very large part of their claim to superiority on purely Jewish grounds, especially on the ground that they are Hebrews. For S. Paul's somewhat bold claim to this title cf. c. IV. § i. n. 3. We have a further allusion to the same charge in iii. 1–4. Naturally it is difficult to be certain as to which of the charges was raised on the reception of 1 Cor. and which on the occasion of S. Paul's unsuccessful visit to Corinth (see notes following), both of which intervene between the writing of 1 Cor. and that of 2 x–end. Apart from those of i. 15–24, however, they appear to be of a general character and therefore such as might have been raised at any stage of the controversy. Hence they are likely to have been raised by this time if not earlier. For those of i. 15–24 see below.

6. 2 Cor. xii. 14, 21, xiii. 1. It is merely playing with words to suppose that these three passages can imply anything but that S. Paul had already paid two visits, *i.e.* the first and another not recorded by S. Luke, to Corinth before these passages were written. Similarly xiii. 2 can only mean that he has already been present in person and denounced the offenders—an action for which his first visit offered no opportunity. The view that *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι* can mean "This is the third time that I contemplate coming" rather than "I am coming for the third time" is hopelessly unnatural. There is no reason to regard the omission of such a visit as a reflection on the accuracy of the narrative of the Acts, which consistently ignores such minor movements. S. Luke has, of course, ignored the whole of the Corinthian episode out of a desire to obliterate the painful memories of the past; but in any case the need for compressing his narrative would render the suppression of this visit natural.

7. 2 Cor. i. 15 *seqq.* It is clear from this passage that S. Paul has at some time since the writing of 1 Cor. announced to the Corinthians his intention of paying a visit to Corinth on his way to Macedonia, and then returning to Corinth from Macedonia on his way to Judaea. This is a complete change of plans as against 1 Cor. xvi. 5. The object was that he might have a second pleasant visit to them before the final parting. The wording of the passage is consistent with the view that there has been an unpleasant visit since S. Paul's first visit to Corinth, though

it does not necessarily imply it. On the other hand it is infinitely more natural to interpret 2 Cor. ii. 1 as meaning that he has in fact paid one unpleasant visit and is anxious to avoid another. Coupled with the evidence adduced in the previous note this makes it entirely impossible to evade the necessity of accepting a second visit to Corinth not mentioned in the Acts.

8. The first of the charges to which S. Paul is replying in 2 Cor. i. 15 is that he has announced a new plan of journeying from Ephesus to Corinth, Corinth to Macedonia and back from Macedonia to Corinth, as against the original plan of travelling to Corinth through Macedonia (*i.e.* the plan originally announced in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 and subsequently carried out). In reply to this some group of critics has charged him with fickleness in changing his plans, while in some fashion their charges have been mixed up with the phrases *ναί, ναί* and *οὔ, οὔ*. Taken by itself S. Paul's language is quite incomprehensible, but it becomes easily intelligible if the passage is compared with Jas iv. 13 and v. 12. Here we have two typical tenets of the extremely literal piety of Hebrew Christianity laid down for general observance. The Jewish teachers at Corinth would naturally be familiar with such tenets, and would regard them as essential features of the true Christian character. Nothing could be more inconsistent with such teaching than the sudden arrival of S. Paul announcing yet a further change of plans and substituting for the pious expressions of Jas iv. 15 such language as that of 2 Cor. i. 23 (cf. xi. 10, xii. 19). They have pointed out S. Paul's fickleness and his use of language of an almost blasphemous character, as judged by the standards of Palestinian pietism. S. Paul replies with a contemptuous distortion of the catchwords *ναί, ναί* and *οὔ, οὔ* as applied to himself which is in fact scarcely intelligible, and entirely so apart from its use by his opponents. The general sense is: "My critics say that I make up my plans on purely carnal and worldly lines and express them in a worldly fashion, instead of expressing them in the proper language of Christian piety and confining myself in my speech to 'yea, yea' and 'nay, nay.' My answer is the effect of my work among you at Corinth. There was no yea and nay about it. It was a revelation of the power of the Son of God and, far from being contradictory and ineffective, sometimes yea and sometimes nay, it was a positive affirmation of His power in the form of your conversion." But the passage is confused by S. Paul's sudden change from the original use of *ναί, ναί* and *οὔ, οὔ* by his critics to the use of *ναὶ καὶ οὔ* (apparently invented by himself on the spur of the moment) in a manner wholly impossible to any other writer.

9. 2 Cor. ii. 5, vii. 12 imply that S. Paul had received some grievous personal injury from one of his opponents at Corinth. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary it is natural to identify this opponent with the single personal opponent to whom S. Paul replies in x. 1–11, who appears to be the leader of the party of Christ (*v.* 7). The inference cannot be certain, since there were several opponents and the person referred to in 2 Cor. ii. 5 may have been dealt with in the earlier part of the letter now lost. None the less the identification is probable. Whether he was the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1 is less easy to answer. There is no necessary reason for supposing that the actual leader of the antinomian party at Corinth was also the worst practical exponent of the results to which its doctrines logically led. Further, it is clear that the offence dealt with in the two passages in the earlier part of 2 Cor. refers to a personal injury inflicted on S. Paul, and consequently that the offence he has in mind is not the offence of 1 v. 1, but something committed later. The identification is possible, but there is no evidence in support of it; and it may be doubted whether S. Paul would have been so interested in the personal matter in the case of an offender guilty of so grave a sin against the whole Christian body as that of 1 v. 1.

10. The letter in question is of course, on the hypothesis advanced in n. 1, that of which 2 Cor. x–end formed the conclusion. The opening section now lost contained S. Paul's reply to the leader of the antinomian party or "party of Christ"; what remains is the end of that reply, which leads up to his reply against his Jewish critics, and his final warnings.

For the danger involved in a failure of the collection see § i. nn. 18, 22.

11. This seems to be implied in 2 Cor. vii. 7, 14, the consolation experienced by Titus at his coming to Corinth and the boasts which S. Paul made to Titus on

behalf of the Corinthians referring to the fears which he felt and expressed to S. Paul as to the probable effect of the letter.

12. Although S. Paul "boasted" about the Corinthians to Titus, it is clear from 2 Cor. i. 8 *seqq.*, ii. 12 *seqq.*, vii. 5 that his anxiety, coupled with the circumstances of his departure from Ephesus, left him in a state of the most profound depression. The same anxiety makes itself felt in the rapid fluctuations of tone in the closing chapters of 2 Cor., in which it is clear that S. Paul is desperately afraid of being forced to put his threats into execution. (These chapters are, of course, part of the letter entrusted to Titus.)

13. 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2 *seqq.* The Corinthians had been enthusiastic about the scheme when it was first broached to them, but S. Paul knows that that enthusiasm had produced very little actual result. In order, however, to avoid saying anything which might lead to soreness of feeling among the Corinthians he expresses himself as though the first enthusiasm was the really important thing in *v.* 10 (not only to do, but to will); only the difficulty of S. Paul's position explains this extraordinary reversal of the natural order.

"Last year" (*ἀπὸ πέρυσι* or "a year ago"?) presumably refers to the time when the suggestion was first made. S. Paul is writing about Pentecost of A.D. 55 (see § ii. n. 1) and refers to the time when he first suggested the matter, either by letter or by a delegate in the previous year, before the troubles had developed at Corinth. The exact date at which he made the suggestion is unimportant.

14. 1 Cor. xvi. 4, 6, where S. Paul is doubtful as to his movements after the contemplated visit to Macedonia and Corinth. It seems that his decision to go to Jerusalem was dictated by the necessity of stimulating the liberality of the Gentile converts. In view of the obvious dangers it would have been natural for him not to go there.

It is to be observed that S. Luke only places S. Paul's decision to go to Jerusalem at this point (Acts xix. 21), coupling with it the decision to proceed to Rome afterwards. But in point of fact S. Paul had often formed plans for doing so which he had been forced to abandon (Ro. i. 15). It is highly probable that he had prior to the troubles at Corinth hoped to avoid the necessity of returning to Jerusalem with the collection and to proceed direct to Rome.

15. Ro. xv. 24. S. Paul's desire to visit Spain is curious. There seems to be no evidence of the existence of Jews in Spain at this period, and S. Paul still regards it as his duty to offer the Gospel to the Jews first wherever he goes (Ro. i. 16, Acts xxviii. 17). Further he would find it difficult in these circumstances to gain a preliminary hearing for the Gospel among the Gentiles, or to find reliable converts, whether Jews or Gentiles brought up in Judaism, who could be regarded as sufficiently reliable to be put in charge of such Churches as he might be able to found.

Further, Spain was in general a Latin-speaking country and we have no evidence that S. Paul had any acquaintance with the language. No doubt he would find in Spain a number of persons able to speak Greek, and it is probable that there were a certain number of Jewish inhabitants. But it seems strange that he should have desired to visit Spain when there were far better openings in many other places, notably in Alexandria, the chief centre after Rome of the Jewish Dispersion. On the whole it seems most probable that his ambition to reach Spain was due to the prophecy of Mal. i. 11. There seems to be an allusion to the text in the account of S. Paul given in Clement of Rome, *Ad Cor.* v. 6, 7, a passage which suggests that the writer either knew that S. Paul had in fact reached Spain (he could hardly live in Rome and describe it as the limit of the West), or that he had heard S. Paul express his ambition to do so. For the popularity of the text among the early Christians as evidence for the admission of the Gentiles to the Church cf. Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 28. Naturally, however, this view can only be put forward as a conjecture (cf. Leclercq in *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.* v. 410, Art. "Espagne").

16. Cf. § ii. n. 21. For the growth of lawlessness in Judaea at this period cf. *Antt.* xx. viii. 5, *B.J.* ii. xiii. 2 *seqq.*

17. Acts xix. 21, where the decision is said to have been made *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, the phrase apparently referring to a decision made under the influence of the Holy Ghost. That his decision was so determined is clear from Acts xx. 23, xxi. 4, 11

seqq., and that he had a clear understanding of the dangers from the same passages and Ro. xv. 31.

18. S. Paul's movements at this point seem to have been undecided. This was inevitable, as they depended on the result of the mission of Titus to Corinth. The visit threatened in 2 Cor. xii. 14 could not be delayed until the end of a journey through Macedonia, if the Corinthians persisted in their rebellion. On the other hand, at the time when Titus was despatched S. Paul had decided to leave Ephesus, since he had arranged to meet him at Troas (2 Cor. ii. 13). The decision to leave Ephesus is, however, implied in Acts xix. 21 to have been made before the riot at Ephesus, since the mention of the mission of Timothy and Erastus, a detail of no importance whatsoever, seems to be inserted to prove that S. Paul was not forced to leave Ephesus by the disturbance. The point would possess a certain apologetic value for Gentile readers, since it would show that S. Paul had not left under pressure from the local authorities, and was not regarded by them as responsible for the events which preceded his departure. This is to some extent confirmed by 2 Cor. i. 8 *seqq.*, where there seems to be an allusion to the riot at Ephesus. Since, however, in this letter S. Paul mentions it as something unknown to the Corinthians, it follows that it was unknown to Titus when he left Ephesus with S. Paul's ultimatum. S. Paul had, however, decided to leave when he despatched the ultimatum, since he had arranged that Titus should meet him at Troas. It would seem that he despatched Titus about the same time as Timothy and Erastus, at a time when he had already decided to leave Ephesus. Had Titus brought back an unfavourable report, he would have gone straight to Corinth, either from Troas, or from some point in Macedonia.

19. See for the industry of Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen in its relation to Acts xix. 23 *seqq.* Ramsay's *Church in the Roman Empire*, 112 *seqq.*, and the same author in Hastings' *D.B.* i. 605 (Art. "Diana of the Ephesians") and 720 (Art. "Ephesus").

20. For the Asiarchs cf. Ramsay *s.v.* in Hastings' *D.B.* i. 172 and cf. § ii. n. 20. It is however possible that those who had once held office retained the title; in this case the Asiarchs in question may have been genuine converts.

21. See for the whole question of the relation of Christianity to the Roman government c. vi. § i. nn. 25, 26. Provincial and local officials were not likely to interfere with a new Jewish cult, so long as it only affected the Jews and a comparatively trifling number of proselytes (cf. c. vi. § v. nn. 37, 38). Since, on the other hand, the formation of new religious associations was technically illegal, it was always possible for magistrates to find legal reasons for suppressing it; and it can hardly be doubted that they would have been perfectly prepared to do so in the face of a strong popular demand. Neither proconsuls nor municipal authorities would be likely to risk serious unpopularity in such a matter, especially as they would technically be in the wrong, except on S. Paul's view that the Church had really inherited the privileges of Israel. Such a view would hardly be likely to commend itself to a Gentile magistrate.

22. Acts xix. 22 is one of the passages which are of primary importance for testing S. Luke's method of writing history. At first sight it might be supposed to be utterly pointless. It could be omitted without in any way disturbing the narrative, and the fact that S. Paul sent Timothy and Erastus on to Macedonia in advance is of no interest to anyone. The movements of Timothy and Erastus, as of the rest of S. Paul's companions, are normally ignored; Timothy has been left out of sight since xviii. 5, and disappears completely afterwards except for his mention in the list of delegates in xx. 4.

The facts of S. Luke's narrative are indeed confirmed by 1 Cor. iv. 17 and xvi. 10, where S. Paul has in fact sent Timothy (and presumably Erastus) on before him, while he remains at Ephesus. But this offers no explanation of the insertion at this point of so irrelevant a detail.

The explanation seems to lie in S. Luke's anxiety to prove the respectability of Christianity. There had been a riot over the preaching of it at Ephesus, and the riot had resulted in the departure, almost immediately afterwards, of the leading Christian missionary. The obvious inference would be that he had left because it was no longer safe for him to remain, possibly because the magistrates had issued

orders for him to leave. In any case there was strong reason for suspecting the character of a movement, if its leading teacher was mixed up in a riot in circumstances which made it necessary for him to leave the city. This objection S. Luke meets by pointing out that in fact S. Paul's departure had nothing to do with the riot; he had made his plans to leave before it occurred, and indeed he had actually begun to put them into execution.

That S. Paul's delay at Ephesus at this moment was due to a sudden spread of the Gospel among the Gentiles seems clear from 1 Cor. xvi. 8, which suggests that S. Paul, writing about Easter, has suddenly found a new means of reaching the Gentile public. If his mission were simply proceeding on normal lines with a steady accession of converts from day to day, but no particular new developments, it would hardly be necessary for him to remain at Ephesus, and still less necessary for him to explain the reason to the Corinthians. The words are only intelligible if they refer to a sudden movement towards Christianity at Ephesus, which rendered his presence necessary until Pentecost. Such a sudden development after a long period of normal development is by no means improbable. The interpretation suggested is confirmed by the incident of Acts xix. 23 *seqq*. There seems no reason for the sudden outburst of hostility, unless Christianity had begun to make such rapid progress as to attract a considerable amount of attention and thus risen from an insignificant sect of Judaism into a dangerous rival of the cult of Artemis of Ephesus. For the possibility of a wave of conversions on such a scale as to produce a serious effect on the established Gentile religions cf. § ii. n. 23. There is no reason for supposing that S. Paul's mission at Ephesus could not have produced a quite noticeable effect in spite of its comparative brevity.

23. It would seem that the crowd have no very clear idea of any distinction between Christianity and Judaism. The unpopularity of the Jews in Asia appears from *Antt.* XVI. vi. 1. The Imperial edicts in their favour quoted by Josephus in this chapter would tend to increase their unpopularity, although checking open attacks on the nation.

24. For the importance of this official cf. the article on "Ephesus" by Ramsay referred to in n. 19.

25. The Jewish hatred of idolatry was naturally regarded as a sign of hatred to all religion, cf. Pliny, *N.H.* xiii. 4 (9), Tac. *Hist.* v. 5, and the edict of Claudius quoted in *Antt.* XIX. v. 3. [It is to be noted that Ro. ii. 22 cannot be quoted as evidence that the Jews were ever guilty of acts of sacrilege against Gentile shrines, since the correct translation appears to be "Dost thou rob the Temple (at Jerusalem)?" Cf. c. VI. § iv. n. 21.]

26. There was always a fear that a purely local disturbance might develop into something more serious, and the size and importance of Ephesus made it singularly liable to such suspicions. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* v. 10, xiv. 57. Cf. also the suspicions excited by the conduct of Apollonius of Tyana at Ephesus in Philostratus' account of his life (vii. 20 *seqq*.). The high rank of the proconsul of Asia would make it necessary for him to avoid any suspicion of undue leniency in dealing with an affair of this character, since it might easily be ascribed to ulterior political motives and so made the basis for a charge of *majestas*. For the punishment of cities for illegal actions on the part of their citizens cf. Tac. *Ann.* iv. 36, xiv. 17.

27. It was probably fortunate for the Church that S. Paul's opponents put themselves in the wrong by their disorderly proceedings. It is difficult to suppose that a charge of blasphemy would not have been upheld against him alike in the proconsular court and the assembly of Ephesus. S. Paul could indeed have appealed to the Emperor, but it is unlikely that he would have succeeded. The result might well have been to expose the Church to general persecution some ten years earlier than was actually the case.

28. See above, § ii. n. 11. It has been shown that Ephesus was the natural centre for organizing the collection, and it is hardly credible that S. Paul did not intend originally to make it the final meeting-place for the delegates of the various groups of Churches. His original plan was to return to Jerusalem direct from Corinth, but he would certainly have touched at Ephesus on the voyage (Acts xx. 3, and cf. xviii. 19). Here he would have met the Asiatic delegates (or possibly at Miletus,

to avoid the necessity of a personal visit to Ephesus itself). This was abandoned, but it is probable that the actual meeting of delegates, which seems to have taken place at Philippi, was originally intended to happen in Asia. It is hardly credible that S. Paul should have brought them to Corinth, thus exposing the sums collected to the risk of the journey from Ephesus to Corinth and back to Ephesus. There was not only the danger of the voyage but also that of awkward legal questions and the interference of minor officials. Further, in Ro. xvi. 21 *seqq.*, none of the delegates from Asia are at Corinth with the exception of Timothy, who is, of course, not a delegate except in the same sense as S. Paul, *i.e.* he represents the Galatian Churches as being a distinguished Christian, but he has been with S. Paul during the time of the collection, and though of Galatian origin is not in the same sense as the other delegates a representative of one of S. Paul's Asiatic or Galatian Churches. Similarly, in Ro. xv. 26, S. Paul represents the collection as confined to the Churches of Macedonia and Achaea, ignoring those of Galatia and Asia; he could hardly do so if their delegates were actually in his company. Thus it would seem that the meeting of delegates, which appears from Acts xx. 4 to have taken place at Philippi, or possibly at Thessalonica, except for the author who joins the party at the former city, represents a change of S. Paul's plans. Similarly, the sending on of some of the delegates to Troas and the delay of a week at that port are probably to be ascribed to the fact that their collections were deposited at Ephesus, and had to be transported from the latter city to Troas or Miletus in order to obviate the danger that S. Paul might be tempted to delay his journey for a considerable time, if he went to Ephesus at all. It is true that there is no evidence to this effect in the Acts; but that work gives no information at all on the subject apart from the one allusion in Acts xxiv. 17 (cf. § i. n. 27). In any case it is difficult to suppose that S. Paul's agents from Asia and Galatia did not in fact deposit their collections at Ephesus and leave them there while they went to Macedonia; they would hardly have transported large sums of money with them.

29. 2 Cor. i. 8 *seqq.*

30. *Ib.* ii. 12. It is clear that S. Paul had expected to find Titus there, and it is to be presumed that Troas had been fixed for the meeting-place. It is possible that the failure was due to the fact that S. Paul had left Ephesus a few days earlier than he had intended on account of the riot.

31. It was obviously desirable that Christians on their journeys should be able to spend Sundays in the company of their fellow-Christians. The journey from Philippi to Troas might apparently be managed in three days (Acts xvi. 11) but might take five (Acts xx. 6). From Troas to Miletus was another four (*ib.* 13 *seqq.*). Naturally the journey might take longer in unfavourable circumstances. [It seems probable that the seven days of Acts xx. 6 represent two Sundays spent at Troas, the departure taking place on Sunday, the Eucharist having been celebrated between Saturday night and Sunday morning. The message to the elders at Ephesus and their journey to Miletus would occupy two days, and they would thus reach S. Paul, the message having been sent on Thursday, some time in the course of Saturday (cf. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.* III. 368).] Thus, allowing for the chances of delay, Troas was a natural point to choose for the establishment of the Church as the half-way house between the Churches of Macedonia and Asia.

32. The Church at Troas is of some importance as a test of S. Luke's methods. It is the only place at which we find a community of Pauline origin of whose foundation he has given no specific record. (This, of course, does not apply to the period of S. Paul's activities in Syria and Cilicia of which he gives no detailed account.) On the other hand, it appears from 2 Cor. ii. 12 that in fact, though S. Paul had preached there, he had broken off his work almost as soon as it was started, and therefore S. Luke's silence as to the first visit is natural. The only indication that S. Paul preached at any places except those mentioned in the Acts, and those closely adjoining them, is the reference to Illyricum in Ro. xv. 19 on which see c. VI. § v. n. 44. Thus it seems that in general we have no reason to suppose that S. Luke has omitted to notice any of the centres at which S. Paul preached.

33. Assuming 2 Cor. i–ix inclusive to be a separate Epistle, with only a more or less personal conclusion omitted, it is clear that there is, when S. Paul writes, no further opposition at Corinth, the collapse of his opponents being due to the firmness of the previous letter (vii. 6 *seqq.*).

34. 2 Cor. ii. 5 *seqq.*

35. This can only be conjectured. But they are no longer a living force as an opposition in the first nine chapters of 2 Cor., and if they were in fact honest and well-meaning Christians, who had genuinely held that the scandals at Corinth needed reforming, but doubted S. Paul's authority to do so, it is reasonable to suppose that they would withdraw from the city when S. Paul's second letter produced the desired effect rather than prolong a residence which could only lead to fresh disputes.

36. 2 Cor. ix. 2 *seqq.*, from which it appears that S. Paul is stimulating the two groups of Churches by describing to each the enthusiasm of the other.

37. 2 Cor. viii. 8, and see above, § iii. n. 38.

38. S. Paul is throughout this letter too enthusiastic to follow any coherent order. The motives to which he appeals, in order to stimulate the liberality of the Corinthians, are:

(*a*) The example of Our Lord in His Incarnation (viii. 9), coupled with the fact that He was Himself one of those for whom S. Paul is appealing, *i.e.* one of the πτωχοί.

(*b*) The rewards which the Corinthians will reap, both from the fact that the περίσσευμα of the Hebrews will at the Second Coming of the Lord be available to make up for their own ὑστέρημα, just as now their own περίσσευμα is making up for the ὑστέρημα of the Hebrews and also from the fact that God will in this life reward their liberality (viii. 13 *seqq.* and ix. 6 *seqq.*, cf. § i. n. 19). Further their generosity will, owing to the gratitude of the Hebrews, redound to the glory of God (ix. 12).

39. 2 Cor. viii. 17 *seqq.* Titus indeed is represented as having been so much impressed by the submission of the Corinthians that he was anxious to go of his own accord—an additional compliment. For the Apostolic colleague cf. § i. n. 27. There is no evidence as to the identity of the last of the three emissaries mentioned.

40. 2 Cor. viii. 20.

41. The whole letter is utterly confused owing to S. Paul's jubilation, which is mixed up with reminiscences of the arguments with which he has been defending himself during the past controversy. Thus i. 3–11 is an outburst of joy, contrasted with the past depression, followed in *v.* 12 by the opening of a defence of his past career. At *v.* 15, however, this breaks off into a particular defence of his change of plans against the old criticisms of his Jewish opponents. At *v.* 23 his explanation of his motive for this change, namely, his desire to spare the Corinthians, leads him on to a fresh track, the explanation of his last letter, and a plea for the now defeated opponent. At ii. 12 he returns to an explanation of his movements, but leaves this at *v.* 14 for a further outburst of joy at his triumph. This, however, reminds him of the criticisms of the Jewish opponents as to his fondness for commending himself (iii. 1–3), to which he replies with a glorification of the Christian ministry (iii. 4–end). This serves the double purpose of removing from the mind of his readers any idea that there is in Judaism any permanent value, which gives to Jewish Christians who obey the Law some kind of superiority over other Christians, and also of explaining that S. Paul is not commending himself but only glorifying the new revelation of which he is a minister. In c. iv he passes from the more immediately controversial side of the subject to the exposition of the fundamental point of all his theology, namely, that Christianity is essentially a new life in the Christian, achieved by sharing in the death and Resurrection of Jesus. It is noticeable that at this point S. Paul, perhaps as the result of his experience with the Corinthians, allows more for the possibility of regarding the process of conversion as a gradual one, beginning at baptism but only ending at the judgment seat of Christ. Thus, while it is true that the convert receives a new life in Christ, yet that life is not the resurrection, but the beginning of it; it is only to be finally completed on the day of judgment. At v. 11 he returns to the defence of his ministry, primarily as against

the Jews (*vv.* 12, 16, which apparently refer to the claim of his Jewish opponents to a superior knowledge of Our Lord's earthly life. To this S. Paul replies that any earthly knowledge of Christ which he may have had is nothing to the new knowledge of Him which is given to the Christian in his new spiritual life). At vi. 11 he passes to his antinomian opponents, and here as usual the weakness of his theology as a reasoned system makes itself felt. He urges that the new life of the Christian is inconsistent with any compromise with idolatry or the sins of the flesh; but he gives no proof of it as against the opponent who holds that in fact he feels no such inconsistency. At vii. 2 he returns to his joy at the repentance of the Corinthians, passing at c. viii to the subject of the collection.

42. This was the late autumn of A.D. 55, the three months at Corinth being the winter of A.D. 55–56. Had not the Jewish plot forced him to change his plans, he would have spent the Passover at Jerusalem.

CHAPTER VIII

THE END OF THE JOURNEYS

§i. PAUL AND ROME

At Corinth Paul felt himself at a turning-point in his career. The communities which he had founded between the Syrian Antioch and Corinth were established in the faith. They had vindicated their loyalty to the Mother-Church of Christendom and to the teaching entrusted to its charge by the alms which they had collected for its support[1]. At the same time it might be hoped that they had passed through the difficulties which were liable to attend the first foundation of any Church, whether in the form of external persecution or in that of internal dissensions and distortions of the Gospel. Thus his continued personal supervision was no longer necessary; and his recent experiences at Corinth had shown that in matters where patience and tact were more necessary than burning outbursts of enthusiasm he could act more effectively through letters and delegates than through personal visits[2]. All that remained was to set the seal on this stage of his labours by visiting Jerusalem as the bearer of the collection which was the proof of the loyalty of the Gentile Christians, before proceeding to fresh labours in other lands.

The next stage was bound to begin with a visit to Rome, the capital of the world. Here indeed he had to depart from the line of action which he had hitherto followed. Rome had already been evangelized, and he had avoided working where others had preached before him. None the less the call of the city was imperative. Its size and importance as the centre of Western civilization offered opportunities which he could not neglect. Moreover, he had ample experience of the advantage of confining his labours to large cities, where he could preach with comparative security from persecution, and be certain that the Gospel would gradually permeate to regions where he himself could not go without exciting such violent opposition from his fellow-countrymen as to neutralize to a large extent the effect of his preaching. The size of Rome and the mixed character of its population also enabled him to preach there without actually addressing himself directly to those who had already heard the Gospel from others, and thus the breach in his usual rule of procedure might well prove in fact negligible[3]. There was, moreover, one matter in which his presence at Rome was somewhat seriously needed. The existing community was predominantly Jewish[4], and there was always a danger that the Jewish Christians would tend more or less un-

consciously to assume a tone of superiority over the Gentiles on the strength of their position as members of the Chosen People, or, on the other hand, that the Gentiles would by a natural reaction revolt against the Jews, and in their zeal for liberty from the Law look down on those who still observed it. The result might well be a recurrence of that revolt against all Christian morality which had already taken place at Corinth. If the danger of a breach between the two elements in the Church was faced in advance, it was hardly likely to prove serious; but if it were neglected, it might well assume the most dangerous proportions[5].

Paul, however, had to proceed with caution in the matter. Although the Jewish converts admitted the liberty of Gentiles as regards the Law they might well feel some hesitation about it and might not feel very friendly towards the teacher who was known to be primarily responsible for the action of the Church in deciding to admit the Gentiles without requiring that they should accept the obligations of proselytes[6]. That decision had involved them in an almost complete separation from the rest of the nation, and had also compelled them to abandon their proud claim to be the only people of the world that knew the true God. They might well feel sore at being called upon to make so great a surrender. The difficulty of Paul's position was increased by the distortions of his teaching by some of his opponents among the Jewish Christians[7]. His teaching that Christianity conferred on those who accepted it a new righteousness superior to that achieved by the most scrupulous observance of the Law, and therefore that there was no need for those who possessed the higher form of righteousness to trouble themselves about the old, could easily be misinterpreted to mean that the Christian, having some new form of righteousness, had no need to trouble himself about the ordinary laws of right and wrong. In fact, since righteousness was a free gift from God in the form of a new life in Christ by which the believer was set free from sin, the more he sinned from the point of view of the ordinary standard of morality, the greater was his testimony to the power of the free gift of God which enabled man to be acceptable to Him even while he continued sinning. Theologically there was a good deal of Paul's language which admitted of such an interpretation, since he generalized from his own particular case, and did not allow for the possibility that those who had not enjoyed his own rigorous training in Jewish morality might not experience that freedom from the sense of sin which his conversion had brought with it. Further Paul as a Pharisee did not recognize any distinction between the

various elements in the Jewish Law[8]. It was all a code of divine origin, and he therefore did not distinguish between elements which were of permanent obligation and others which were only of temporary force. His view of Christianity involved the abolition of all conception of Law in favour of his belief that Christianity was a new life. But for those who did not feel the power of that new life sufficiently to be able to overcome the ordinary temptations of heathenism, he had no logical reply, based on the necessity of observing the laws of morality as a means of attaining to the full power of the new life in Christ. Here his system was logically weak, and his opponents had some solid basis for their objections, though they were not very scrupulous in the use which they made of them.

In order to meet these dangers Paul wrote from Corinth to the Christian community at Rome announcing his intention of paying them an early visit, as soon as his visit to Jerusalem was accomplished. The letter was a general *apologia* for his teaching. He admitted the justice of the Jewish horror for the vices of Gentile society, and the belief that these sins were themselves the punishment of the sin of idolatry into which the Gentiles had fallen in spite of the fact that God in His works had left opportunities for arriving at a truer judgment of His nature[9]. None the less, no one could claim to judge the Gentiles in the matter; for there were many among them who lived by the light of conscience quite as well as the Jew who had the light of the Law to guide him, while there were many among the Jews who in spite of the Law lived no better than the worst of the Gentiles[10]. The Jews might indeed claim the proud privilege of having been entrusted with the revelation of the one true God; but they could not claim that they had lived up to their privileges, since that revelation distinctly asserted that all had fallen into sin[11]. The Law brought a knowledge of sin, but had not enabled its possessors to attain to righteousness. The Christian revelation had, however, brought a free gift of righteousness to those who accepted it, through the blood of Christ; but this was not due to any merits of the Jews and gave them no claim to boast of their position. This righteousness was given not as any reward of past good works but solely in virtue of faith, as the story of Abraham proved. He believed while yet uncircumcised, and the fact of his belief was imputed to him as an act of righteousness which was rewarded by God, out of generosity and not as his due, by the giving of the first covenant. That first promise had been fulfilled in Christ; and those who wished to receive the benefits of it must do so in the same way as Abraham, by an act

of faith[12]. Through this faith the believer was, by a free gift from God, delivered from the old death which sin involved and, being reconciled to God, obtained a new life in Christ, in Whom the results of Adam's fall are reversed[13]. This new life however involved, not the right to continue in sin while enjoying the new privileges of the free gift by which man was reconciled to God, but a complete change of outlook by which the whole life was directed to God[14]. The Christian was delivered from sin and could have no desire to return to that bondage of the Law, under which he had lived in the past, conscious of his sins yet unable to escape from them. The Law was good, but ineffective, since it revealed sin, but conferred no power to escape from the domination of the inward desire for evil. This inward desire for sin was, however, replaced in the Christian by the spirit of Christ, which enabled him to accomplish what the Law was powerless to do[15].

After an outburst of enthusiastic praise of the blessings of the new dispensation[16] Paul proceeded to deal with the difficulty felt by the Jewish convert as to the fate of his unbelieving brethren. God had appointed that some should be saved, and that others should perish; and it was not for man to complain, if God had rejected some of the Jews and saved some of the Gentiles instead. After all the promise had always been to a remnant of Israel, not to the whole people. Moreover, the Jews were themselves to blame for not recognizing that Jesus was the Saviour, and further for not seeing that faith in Him was the only thing necessary for salvation. But if faith was necessary, it followed that the Gospel must be preached to the Gentiles, in order that they too might have the chance of believing, and so fulfilling the prophecies which foretold the time when they should be saved; and it was the fault of the Jews that they opposed the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles and allowed themselves to be turned away from the truth by the fact that the Gentiles were being allowed to hear it. The present rejection of all but a remnant was however only temporary. The Gentiles had been allowed to enter first in order to provoke the Jews to greater efforts in order to regain those privileges which they had forfeited. When they saw the Gentiles coming in they would themselves be restored to the truth and would complete the fulness of the new dispensation[17].

From the Jews Paul turned to the Gentile converts and warned them to avoid the temptation of despising the Jews[18]. They must remember that it was only the mercy of God that had saved them and rejected Israel. The time would come when the remnant of Israel would be restored. For the rest he warned them against the dangers of

pride and the divisions to which it might lead at Rome, as it had at Corinth[19]. After sketching a portrait of the Christian character, he inferred from it the duty of avoiding anything that might be regarded as disaffection to the civil rulers of the Empire, a warning the need of which the earlier history of the Church in the city had shown[20]. The Christian's duty was to practise the virtue of Christian love and so prepare himself for the end of all things[21]. In particular he must show the utmost forbearance towards those who still held it safest to retain in their daily lives some elements of observance of the Jewish Law which they had learnt before their conversion. Such scruples might be a mark of weakness, but they were none the less to be respected; in any case they were less reprehensible than the spirit which condemned them[22]. The letter concluded with an apology for anything in it that might seem to imply an authority at Rome which Paul had no right to claim, ascribing such expressions to his anxiety for the welfare of the Gentile Churches in which he had laboured with such success, and announced his intention of paying an early visit to Rome as soon as he had finished with the collection[23]. He naturally added his greetings to the many Roman Christians whom he had met during their temporary exile at Corinth and to others of whose labours for the Roman Church he had learnt by hearsay[24]. This letter was despatched from Corinth shortly before the end of Paul's winter stay in the city. His original intention had been to sail direct to Jerusalem, where he hoped to spend the Passover. His plan was thwarted by the discovery that the Jews on board his ship, who were travelling to Jerusalem with the same purpose as himself, had discovered his identity and formed a plot to murder him. It was an ominous warning of the probable result of his journey, but he could not withdraw from it. It was, however, safer to change his route and abandon any attempt to reach Jerusalem before Pentecost, when the city would be less crowded with Jewish visitors from abroad. In the interval he could pay a final visit to his friends in Macedonia. The delegates from the Churches of Asia and Galatia were notified of his change of plans and warned to meet him at Philippi, where he spent the double festival of Easter and the Passover, the representatives of some at least of the Gentile Churches being sent on to Troas[25]. After Easter Paul himself rejoined them and passed a week consolidating the little body of Christians who had been converted at Troas during the preceding summer[26]. At Miletus he spent a Sunday in the society of the elders of the Church at Ephesus; he dared not face the temptation to delay in a city in which

he had so large a body of converts, especially since his plans for the future rendered it in the highest degree unlikely that he would ever meet them again in the flesh.

As his journey brought him nearer to Jerusalem Paul's spiritual sense of impending danger grew continually stronger and was intensified by the warnings, delivered under the inspiration of the Spirit, which were given to him by the friends with whom he lodged. By a series of coincidences the last stages of his route brought him into the society of several of those who had been closely connected with the earliest development of the life of the Gentile Churches[27], Philip, the most prominent of the disciples of the martyred Stephen, and the first to see that the martyr's principles involved the necessity of admitting all men to the privileges of the Gospel whether they were by race of the Chosen People or not, and Agabus the prophet, whose warnings had first led to the decision of the Antiochene Church to assist with their alms the Saints of Jerusalem. The last stage was made in the company of a Cypriot Jew, named Mnason, who had been one of the original refugees from the persecution that followed the death of Stephen, and one of the first evangelists of the island. With him Paul was to lodge, and with him in the party Paul could feel that the representation of the Churches formed since the beginning of his great appeal to the Gentile world was finally complete.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII, SECTION I

1. See above, c. VII. § i. n. 18.

2. Ro. xv. 23. The explanation given in the text harmonizes with the known facts of S. Paul's career, but does nothing to lessen the astonishing fact that S. Paul after a period of less than ten years regards his work in the Eastern Mediterranean and Asia Minor as completed.

3. In fact it appears from Acts xxviii. 22 that the leading Jews of Rome, whom S. Paul is addressing, have never heard any direct preaching of Christianity, but only know of it by hearsay. Of S. Paul they have heard nothing. This is apparently due to the size of the Jewish colony in Rome and the loose connection of the various synagogues (cf. above, c. VI. § iv. nn. 9 and 20). Thus S. Paul could in practice preach at Rome almost as if he were in a city where the Gospel had not yet been preached. Naturally, however, he could not ignore the existing community there.

4. S. Paul addresses the Jewish section in the community first in his Epistle, and devotes to them by far the greater part of the letter. He would hardly do so unless they were the largest element in the Church, or at any rate the most important.

5. Ro. xi envisages the possibility of a breach between the two elements in the Roman Church. There is a tendency among the Jews to look down on the Gentiles (c. ii) and a tendency among the Gentiles to look down on the Jews. The result, coupled with the natural tendencies to ambition and self-aggrandisement, might well lead to disaster, such as that which had occurred at Corinth (Ro. xii. 3 *seqq.*, the warnings of which are obviously based on S. Paul's past experience, as the close

resemblance to 1 Cor. xii. 4 *seqq.* shows). How far the dangers were actually imminent and known to S. Paul by report, or how far they were only those which his experience at Corinth led him to fear, there is no evidence. S. Paul does not write as though they were very urgent, but it has to be remembered that he is anxious to avoid any appearance of claiming to exercise authority at Rome to which he has no claim (i. 11, xv. 14 *seqq.*).

6. It is important to observe that in the whole of the Epistle to the Romans S. Paul is arguing not against Jewish Christians who wish to impose the Law on the Gentiles, but partly against imaginary Jewish opponents, as in c. ii, and partly with Jewish Christians who accept the position of the Gentiles as advocated by S. Paul, but not without grave misgivings. There is nowhere any hint that S. Paul is writing against Jewish Christians who are actually endeavouring to impose the Law on the Gentiles, though no doubt there were some who would have liked to do so. But the whole Epistle is a reasoned statement of S. Paul's position, not a polemic against actual opponents. See the next note.

7. It is instructive to contrast the temperate tone of S. Paul's general language in the Epistle to the Romans with his sudden flash of controversial anger at iii. 8. Who the opponents were against whom he is arguing here and in vi. 1 is not clear. They are Jews, since their whole argument is directed against a distortion of S. Paul's teaching on the Law. If righteousness is a gift from God which cannot be earned by obedience to the Law (and therefore not by obedience to any other moral code), it follows according to his opponents that the more the Christian sins, the greater is the testimony he gives to the power of God and the greatness of His gift. In other words, by doing evil he increases the good which God does in making him righteous. The argument is the same as that of the antinomian party at Corinth, and is being used by a Jewish opponent as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole Pauline system. There is, however, no trace that it was ever employed against him by his Jewish opponents at Corinth, and it would seem therefore that we have here an attack by other members of the nation. It does not seem that they have actually been attacking him in this way at Rome, since their arguments are only introduced incidentally and dismissed summarily. If there had been any serious attack on S. Paul on these lines at Rome, we should expect a fuller treatment of the subject. Theoretically the objection was a strong one, since S. Paul never found a theological solution to the question why, if righteousness is a gift of divine grace, man should trouble about his conduct instead of waiting for grace to make him righteous with no effort of his own (cf. above, c. vii. § iii. n. 3). Subsequent Christian theologians have failed equally in harmonizing the fact of religious experience that righteousness is only possible by the gift of grace with the no less obvious fact that it demands the exercise of the human will.

8. Cf. c. i. n. 46.

9. Ro. i. 18–32. Cf. c. iv. § i. n. 9 for the similarity of this passage to 4 Esdr., and Appendix I to that section for its relation to Wisdom.

10. The argument of Ro. ii is somewhat confused in order on account of the fact that at *v.* 4 S. Paul digresses from his main theme, that the Jew has no right to judge others, to discuss the combined mercy and severity of the divine judgment. The reasons why the Jew has no right to judge others are (*a*) that many Gentiles obey the Law in fact by the light of conscience, (*b*) that many Jews fail to obey it, though they know it. The passage ii. 17–25 is an interesting sidelight on the pride of the Jews in their position as the guides of the Gentiles in their blindness, and also on the state of morality sometimes to be found among the Jews of the Dispersion. The passage is somewhat inconsistent with the main trend of S. Paul's teaching, since it implies that both Jews and Gentiles could really attain to righteousness by following the light of conscience and obeying the essential principles of morality contained in the Law (cf. especially the statement in *v.* 13 that a doer of the Law may be justified). On the basis of this argument S. Paul's Jewish opponents could have replied effectively that their whole object was to secure not the observance by the Gentiles of the details of the Pharisaical system, but the main principles of the Law, circumcision being a test of the willingness of the proselyte to break with the past. They are answered by implication in the next section, which is intended to prove that even the observance of the Law will not make real righteousness attainable.

11. In c. iii S. Paul has the difficult task of attempting to prove that the Jew has after all some claim to superiority as against the Gentile, without committing himself to anything that might imply a permanent value in the Law as apart from Christianity. The Jews were entrusted with the original divine revelation. Some Jews indeed were disobedient, but this only proves its truth (for it foretold such disobedience), not that it was not in fact of divine origin. This raises the difficult question why, if the sin of some Jews was finally a vindication of the divine revelation, it is just for God to punish those whose sins tended to His glory. This, S. Paul's opponent might argue, is one of those points in which his system logically justifies man in sinning, since the result of the sin is good, namely the increase of the glory of God. S. Paul, however, brushes aside the argument with contemptuous indignation, and re-affirms the fact that the Scriptures themselves proclaim that the Law cannot justify man. The argument here is, of course, purely rabbinical, since it depends on the application to all mankind of isolated texts of Scripture divorced from their context (iii. 9–20). The net result of the whole section is that while the Jew has been entrusted with the divine revelation, yet he is no better off than the Gentile, since he has failed to live up to it; neither is he worse off, since the Gentiles also are under condemnation as sinners.

12. Ro. iii. 21–iv. 25.

13. This is the logical relation of c. v to the argument, the emphasis being on the fact that the gift of man's redemption is entirely undeserved, on account of the sin which reigned in man as a result of Adam's transgression. The sequence of thought is somewhat obscured by the eloquence of the opening verses.

14. Once again in c. vi S. Paul is faced by the fact that his opponents argue that if redemption is a free gift, which man cannot earn by his own personal righteousness, he may just as well continue in sin, and hope that he will receive the divine gift of righteousness none the less. Whatever he does he cannot deserve that gift; indeed his continuance in sin will serve to advance the glory of God. The more he does evil, the greater the good that will come in the revelation of the goodness of God manifested in the salvation of so great a sinner. S. Paul's answer is that the true Christian knows that the old life of sin was in fact a slavery from which he rejoices to have escaped. The answer does in fact express the truth of religious experience, that conversion from sin is felt to be a deliverance which the sinner has done nothing to deserve from a bondage to which, in spite of occasional violent temptations, he has no desire to return. Logically, however, the answer does not meet the objection that if the deliverance be a free gift, it is unnecessary to strive for personal righteousness, since the gift does not depend on any merits of the recipient. The objection as used by S. Paul's opponents has also in its favour the fact that in the case of many Gentiles conversion to Christianity as a religion might not necessarily be accompanied by any desire to accept Christianity as a moral system.

15. vii. 1–viii. 11. The passage vii. 7 *seqq.* refers of course to S. Paul's experience before his conversion; to apply it to his later religious life is to make nonsense of his whole system.

16. viii. 12–end is to be regarded as a summary of the preceding argument, intended rather to kindle the enthusiasm of the reader for his new faith than to serve any doctrinal purpose. It is to be remembered that S. Paul is writing to Jewish Christians who have made great sacrifices and may be tempted to doubt whether it would not have been better to combine Christianity with their old Jewish faith rather than to break with the synagogue by admitting the Gentiles freely. S. Paul, with prophetic eloquence, points out that Christianity is not merely a modification of the old dispensation, but something immeasurably greater, for the sake of which it is worth while to endure any conceivable persecutions.

17. The passage ix. 1–xi. 12 is one of the most confused sections of the Epistle. This is not unnatural since S. Paul is endeavouring to prove by the Old Testament that he is justified in a view of Christianity which has in fact resulted in the admission of the Gentiles to the Church at the expense of the Jews. He begins by repudiating any lack of love for them or any desire to belittle their legitimate claims to pre-eminence in the new dispensation (ix. 1–4). He goes on to justify his position from the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, which shows that

from the first there has been a process of divine selection between those who are children according to the flesh and those who are children according to the promise. This process has been based not on the merit of those chosen, but, as the case of Jacob and Esau shows, on the pleasure of God and that only. Thus in the case of Pharaoh God deliberately raised up a person who by his hardness of heart might serve as a warning to others. To the obvious objection that in this case God cannot blame the sinner, whom He has created to be rejected, S. Paul replies that God is free to do what He wills, and that man has no right to complain, any more than the clay can complain to the potter who makes it into a "vessel for dishonour." At ix. 22 he begins the additional argument that the Christian ought rather to glorify God for having shown mercy to some when none were worthy, than to complain because He bears with the existence of some who were from the beginning "vessels of wrath, fashioned for destruction." This argument is, however, broken off in order to justify from the Old Testament the view that those whom God has chosen are not only Jews but include Gentiles also (ix. 25–29). Having made this point, he does not return to the argument of *vv.* 22–24, but proceeds to explain that the reason for the rejection of Israel was its mistaken attempt to find righteousness in the Law, instead of realizing that the Law could not enable man to attain to the righteousness which it demanded, but was only preparing the way for faith. (At x. 1 he inserts a further expression of his love for his own people, which interrupts the argument of the section ix. 30–x. 5.) He then proceeds to show that in fact the Jews ought to have recognized that faith in Christ is the means of salvation. This he proves by the purely rabbinical application of Deut. xxx. 12 *seqq.* Man has not to perform impossibilities, such as the attainment of righteousness by the observance of the Law, which is just as much out of his power as it would have been to bring Christ down from heaven or to raise Him from the dead. All he has to do is to believe with his heart and to confess with his lips—a thing equally easy for Jew and Gentile. Here again he breaks off in order to justify with a new set of Old Testament prophecies the necessity of preaching to the Gentiles. Two of these, Deut. xxxii. 21 and Is. lxv. 1 *seqq.*, suggest a new line of thought, namely, that the present rejection of all but a remnant of Israel is not to be permanent. At the moment only a remnant are being saved. But the same happened in the days of Elijah. Now, as then, some are being allowed to fall into blindness. But their present fall is to be explained, and God is justified for allowing it, by the fact that it is the means of saving the Gentiles, and also by the fact that the fall of the Jews will serve to provoke them to repentance and so lead in the end to their salvation (cf. xi. 25–32). For the relation of this passage to Jewish thought cf. Wisd. xii. 12, 20, 4 Esdr. vii. 51 *seqq.*, and cf. c. IV. § i. n. 9 and Appendix. Since S. Paul does not take refuge in the rabbinical fiction that the Law was in fact promulgated to the Gentiles and rejected by them, he does not succeed in meeting the charge that since God created men in order that they might be rejected, He has no right to blame them for their sins. This is, of course, the great weakness in S. Paul's whole system; it is the inevitable result of his failure to allow for the operation of free will as well as for that of grace.

18. xi. 13 *seqq.*, and cf. c. VI. § iv. n. 17. It appears that the Gentiles of the community were adopting a somewhat contemptuous attitude towards the Jews (*v.* 18).

19. There is an obvious reference in c. xii to S. Paul's experiences at Corinth; but there is no evidence to show how far there was any danger that events would actually take the same course at Rome as they had taken at Corinth.

20. xii. 9–21 may be regarded either as an amplification of the earlier warning against divisions among Christians or an introduction to the exhortation to obedience to the civil government which follows. The latter passage is somewhat remarkable. It cannot be regarded as a pious platitude which had no particular reference to any actual danger. But it is very striking to find that at the period when S. Paul writes there was a serious possibility of the Gentile Christians becoming involved in opposition to the civil power. There is no hint that the Church is suffering any kind of persecution at the time. It is possible that S. Paul is afraid that some misinterpretation of apocalyptic warnings of the end may lead to outbreaks against the government, but, although this view is to some extent confirmed by the

apocalyptic passage at the end of the chapter, it is hard to suppose that there was any prospect of such outbreaks among the Roman Christians of the period. It seems more probable that the passage xiii. 11 *seqq.* is simply a development of a new train of thought and has no connection with the insistence on obedience to the civil government. In this case it would seem that the motive for the earlier part of the chapter is the failure of the Christians to show proper respect for authority during the riots which led to the expulsion of the Jews from Rome five years before. There is no reason for supposing that the blame lay entirely with the Jews.

There is obviously a difference between this injunction of obedience to authority and those of 1 Pet. ii. 13 *seqq.*, Titus iii. 1; the former of these is written during a time of persecution, while the latter is part of a general summary of Christian duty, and without any special emphasis.

21. xiii. 8–end, and see preceding note.

22. xiv. 1–xv. 6. In this passage the weak brethren to whom S. Paul refers are people who refuse to eat meat, but their exact motives for abstinence are not quite clear. It would be natural to suppose that they abstain for fear that any meat they may eat has been offered to idols. This is confirmed by xiv. 2, but it is doubtful whether this view can be maintained in view of *v.* 14; S. Paul would hardly describe meats offered to idols as κοινά. This word should apply to the Jewish distinction between clean and unclean meats as in Acts x. 14. Hence it seems probable that the weak brethren are Gentiles who still observe the Jewish distinction between clean and unclean meats (cf. *Vita* 3, for Jews who practise vegetarianism for fear of eating unclean meat, and Dan. i. 8). This view is confirmed by *v.* 5, where the reference is to the sabbath and other Jewish holy days. Cf. Juv. *Sat.* xiv. 96, where the observance of the sabbath and abstinence from pork are the first two steps towards becoming a proselyte. It is probable therefore that S. Paul is here referring to those who had been adherents of the synagogue and had scruples about abandoning those elements of Jewish practice to which they had grown accustomed. It is possible that they were already proselytes, but it seems doubtful whether S. Paul would not have held that a proselyte was bound no less than a Jew to continue to observe the Law.

The whole section xi. 11–xv. 13 is, of course, addressed to the Gentile converts, the last passage (xv. 7–13) being a peroration intended to include both sections.

23. xv. 14–33. S. Paul feels that his authority over the Churches of the Gentiles, especially in view of the testimonies of divine approval which it has received, gives him a title to write to the Romans. It is doubtful how far he really considered this authority to extend, and it is possible in view of his compact with the three Apostles at Jerusalem that he would have claimed that Rome really fell within his province (cf. c. v. § iii. n. 22). In any case he wishes to avoid any difficulty that might be caused by the raising of any definite claim and hence apologizes for anything in the Epistle that may sound like an undue assumption of authority.

24. It has, of course, been argued that the personal messages of Ro. xvi. 1–23 do not form part of the Epistle to the Romans, while there is further a certain amount of MS. evidence for the existence in certain places of a version of the Epistle which placed the doxology with which the Epistle now ends (xvi. 25–27) immediately after xiv. 23. The subject is discussed at length by Kirsopp Lake in *E.E.P.* pp. 325 *seqq.* The objection to the view that the personal greetings of xvi. 1–23 form part of an original Epistle to the Romans is purely *a priori*. It is argued that S. Paul would not have many personal friends in Rome, which he had never visited, and that among those whom he greets, two, namely, Prisca and Aquila, appear at Ephesus both in 1 Cor. xvi. 19 and also in 2 Tim. iv. 19. Thus at a time about eleven months prior to the writing of the Epistle to the Romans they were in Ephesus, and they appear there at a later period, when S. Paul writes 2 Timothy. It is argued that even if 2 Timothy be not genuine, yet the passage proves an ancient tradition of their connection with Ephesus. This argument has comparatively little force, since if the letter be spurious it is quite probable that the forger only connected them with Ephesus on the strength of the allusion to their presence there in Acts or 1 Cor. and either overlooked or was not aware of the reference to them in Romans. If, however, the Epistle be genuine, or the work of a forger who knew of their presence in Ephesus towards the close of S. Paul's life, we have to reckon

with the fact that they are in Ephesus before S. Paul writes to the Romans and reappear there later. Epaenetus too is clearly of Asiatic origin as far as his conversion goes (Ro. xvi. 5). To these arguments is added the resemblance between the warnings of xvi. 17, 18 and those of Phil. iii. 19, 2 Tim. iii, and S. Paul's denunciations of antinomianism at Corinth (cf. also Eph. iv. 17 *seqq.*). It is argued that the διδαχὴ ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε must refer to S. Paul's own teaching, and that the passage refers to the danger of antinomian teaching, not to Judaism.

Of these arguments the last may be set aside. On any showing the teaching which the Romans had received was Pauline and Antiochene in character, and there is nothing in the phrase to imply that it was received from S. Paul himself. The danger of antinomianism was always present at Rome, as in other mixed communities; the mere fact that there was a large Jewish element which might be inclined to demand from the Gentiles an observance of the Law would encourage an antinomian reaction. In the second place the argument assumes that the warning is addressed against antinomianism, which is not the case. It is addressed against all teachers who raise divisions by insisting on doctrines of a new character in the hope of gaining notoriety. It would apply just as well to Jews, who caused divisions by urging obedience to the Law as a means of increasing their influence, as to anyone else. Of the remaining arguments on this point the objection that S. Paul could not know personally so many Roman Christians is untrue. The time of his arrival at Corinth coincided with the arrival of Aquila and Prisca from Rome on account of the edict of Claudius that all Jews should leave the city. Although the edict may not have had the desired effect, it is hardly possible to suppose that Aquila and Prisca were the only two Jews affected; and in a general expulsion of Jews from Rome, even though it only affected a comparatively small proportion of the whole Jewish colony, there would probably be many who came to settle at Corinth. This would be specially the case if the edict in fact ordered them to leave not only Rome but Italy, as did the edict of Tiberius in A.D. 19 (Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85), and that of Claudius against astrologers in A.D. 52 (*ib.* xii. 52), since Corinth would be the nearest city of any size to which the refugees could go. Thus it is natural to suppose that there were many Roman Jews and Christians of Jewish origin, and possibly many Christians of Gentile origin, supposed to be Jews on account of the failure to distinguish Judaism from Christianity, residing in Corinth at the time of S. Paul's mission, representing particularly the more prominent of those concerned in the disturbances; it is indeed ludicrous to suppose that Aquila and Prisca were the only two (cf. c. VI. § v. n. 41).

The Asiatic origin of Epaenetus is also irrelevant. He is greeted with a certain Mary, after Aquila and his wife and before Andronicus and Junias, who "are of note among the Apostles." Whoever these may be, they are clearly Christians of very high importance, and it is somewhat remarkable that they are not addressed first of all. The only explanation possible is that S. Paul puts Aquila and his wife first on account of his great personal debt to them. To them he adds two others, and since they are not described as persons of any very obvious distinction it seems fairly certain that they are mentioned here because they have some close personal connection with the two already mentioned, in fact because they are two members of the Church in their house, and are therefore specially well known to S. Paul. This is not surprising. The firstfruits of Asia would naturally be someone converted by Aquila and Prisca during their residence at Ephesus prior to S. Paul's arrival, and it is not unnatural to regard him as a slave bought on their arrival in Ephesus or possibly a Jewish friend or relation met there. If he was a Christian slave he would naturally accompany them on their return to Rome.

The objection that we find Aquila and Prisca at Ephesus some years after the Epistle to the Romans need hardly be taken seriously. S. Paul's immediate personal friends were quite likely to be sent by him to act as his representatives from Asia to Rome and then back from Rome to Asia, and they would hold themselves bound to obey. Apart from the weakness of the whole objection to the presence in Rome of Christians connected with Asia Lightfoot's explanation of the phrases οἱ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου and οἱ ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου must be regarded as too probable to be lightly set aside, more especially in view of the fact that the only one of "those of Aristobulus" personally known to S. Paul bears the name of Herodion, which

in itself suggests a connection with the Herodian dynasty. This supports Lightfoot's view (*Philippians*, 171–8) that "those of Aristobulus" are the slaves and freedmen of the grandson of Herod the Great, bequeathed by him on his death to the Emperor, and "those of Narcissus," the household of the famous freedman of Claudius.

Thus the reasons for supposing that the salutations form part of a letter to Ephesus may be dismissed as unfounded. It is undoubtedly true that a shorter version, which ended at xiv. 23, was current at one time, since some texts, although preserving the concluding portions of the Epistle, have the doxology of xvi. 23 at that point. They further omit the words ἐν Ῥώμῃ in i. 7, substituting ἐν ἀγαπῇ θεοῦ. Thus it has been argued (cf. Kirsopp Lake, *loc. cit.*) that the original Epistle was a general treatise in which S. Paul explained his views on the relation of the Gospel to the Law at length, not primarily a letter to the Roman Church. This cannot be maintained. We have in ii. 22, and probably in xi. 13 *seqq.* and xiii. 1, definite allusions to the history of the Roman Church which would be pointless in a letter to any other community (cf. c. VI. § iv. nn. 17 and 21, and n. 20 above). On the other hand, that an abridged version of a letter to Rome should be made and obtain a wide publicity is only natural. From xv. 14 to xvi. 23 the letter is occupied with purely local matters, which would have no interest for readers outside the Roman Church. Consequently, in MSS. copied for liturgical purposes, *i.e.* for reading at the public worship of the Church outside Rome, they might naturally be omitted. It is clear that in fact a letter of S. Paul's has been thus mutilated, if the view of the composition of 2 Cor. advanced in c. VII. § iv. n. 1 be correct. There were indeed special reasons in that case for such an excision, but a similar reason may be found in the length of the purely local and personal matter which S. Paul includes in Romans as against the other Epistles. The difficulty, however, is that the evidence clearly shows that the shorter version ended, not at the beginning of the purely local matter in xv. 14, but at xiv. 23.

Now, on the assumption that the text of the Epistles, as we possess it, is the original Pauline version, this is not hard to explain. The opening verses of c. xv are definitely anti-Marcionite in their doctrinal implications, since they very clearly identify the God of the Old Testament with the God of the New. Assuming that a shorter edition of the Epistle was current at an early date, from which the purely local matter, xv. 14–xvi. 23, had been omitted, it would be easy for Marcion and his followers to leave out also xv. 1–13. On the other hand, the view tentatively put forward by Kirsopp Lake forces us to suppose that there was originally a letter by S. Paul intended for general circulation, setting forth his views as to the relation of the Gospel to the Law, and ending after xiv. 23 with a conclusion adapted for the particular Church to which it was sent. To this S. Paul has added c. xv at a time when he wished to send his general letter to Rome, this chapter being the conclusion suited for Rome and forming a sort of covering letter. To this again has been added c. xvi, which is a fragment of a letter to Ephesus. The whole process by which the Pauline Epistles came to be regarded as canonical Scriptures is very obscure; but it is almost impossible to suppose that Ephesus and Rome were in such close communication that the fragment of an Ephesian letter and the Roman ending could have been fused at so early a date that no version exists which does not amalgamate them. Clearly the supposition that the purely local sections were omitted when the Epistle was transcribed for liturgical purposes, and that the opening verses of c. xv were omitted under Marcionite influences, is far more simple, while for the reasons already noticed it seems clear that the original letter was intended for Rome, and that there is no reason for doubting that the greetings were also sent to Roman Christians.

It may be added that Lake is influenced by the similarity of Romans and Galatians, and holds that the original general letter was composed at the same time as Galatians, to which he assigns the date suggested in c. VI. § ii. n. 5; but for the reasons there given the superficial similarities of the two Epistles cannot be urged as a proof of proximity in the date of their writing, in face of the still more striking differences between them both in respect of their tone and their subject-matter.

Naturally the alteration in i. 7 is, on the view advanced above, a consequential alteration introduced by the abbreviator when transcribing the Epistle for the use of some other community than the Roman.

25. Cf. c. VII. § iv. n. 28. It may be noted that S. Paul would naturally desire to keep these friends with him for Easter and the Passover, and the fact that he did not do so confirms to some extent the view put forward in that note that they were sent on to transact the business of moving their collections from Ephesus to Troas.

26. c. VII. § iv. n. 32.

27. This appears to be the reason for the mention of S. Philip the Evangelist, Agabus, and Mnason in Acts xxi. 8, 10, and 16.

§ ii. PAUL IN JERUSALEM

Paul could hardly have chosen a more unfavourable moment for his visit. Since the departure of Tiberius Alexander in A.D. 48 Judaea had been ruled by two procurators. Ventidius Cumanus had by his incompetence driven the Jewish nationalists into a state of unrest which was only intensified by his barbarous reprisals[1]. His task was complicated by the fact that Felix, brother of Pallas the powerful freedman of the Emperor Claudius, and himself an influential figure at the court, was during part of his period of office procurator of the Imperial estates in Palestine and openly supported the Jews against the governor. The quarrels of the two officials led to the intervention of Ummidius Quadratus, legate of Syria, who referred the matter to the Emperor. Claudius, however, directed him to deal with the matter himself. Not unnaturally the legate thought it wisest to acquit the brother of Pallas, Felix being even invited to sit as one of the assessors in the trial in which he was himself one of the accused[2]. As a reward for his services to the Jews Felix obtained in A.D. 52, through the intervention of Jonathan the High Priest, the procuratorship of Judaea—an unprecedented honour for a freedman.

Felix rapidly proved his unfitness for the office[3]. His first action was to persuade Drusilla, sister of Herod of Chalcis, to divorce her husband, Azizus, king of Emesa, and to become his wife. Since Azizus had been circumcised as one of the conditions of his marriage with Drusilla, her divorce and her subsequent marriage to an uncircumcised Gentile can hardly have been regarded with favour by Jewish opinion[4]. Meanwhile the nationalist fanatics continued their outbreaks which were met with savage but ineffective reprisals. The protests of Jonathan the High Priest against the misgovernment of Felix, whom he had himself raised to his post, only resulted in his death, which Felix effected through the employment of some of the fanatics whom it was his chief duty to suppress. In the growing public irritation it was natural that several leaders should appear, who claimed to be the Messiah, and offered to lead the nation in

their struggle for freedom. Notable among them was an Egyptian, who led a large number of people to the Mount of Olives, promising that he would from thence cause the walls of Jerusalem to fall down and so inaugurate with a triumph over the Roman garrison the new Messianic kingdom. The rising was suppressed, as were others; but the main result was to increase the number of broken and desperate men in the neighbourhood of the city, who were equally ready for any crime or any patriotic adventure[5]. With no means of subsistence but brigandage, they combined it with a campaign of assassination against all the more moderate Jewish leaders who were suspected of betraying the cause of the nation to the Roman government[6].

The task of those leaders was not an easy one. The continued outrages against the sanctity of the Law which had been contemplated or perpetrated by Roman officials, whose very presence in the land was an intolerable interference with its divinely appointed government, could only be understood if the Romans were indeed the oppressors whose manifestation was to be one of the signs of the coming of the end. This belief was not confined to the orthodox Jews. Although the Christian leaders firmly opposed any attempt among their followers to take part in the nationalist movements of the time, or to accept the claims of those who announced themselves to be the anointed Saviour of the people, yet the Jewish Christians felt as keenly as any of their fellow-countrymen the repeated insults offered to the national faith, whose sanctity they were zealous to uphold[7]. They were likely to resent almost as violently as the rest of the nation any attack on the sanctity of the Law—the more so as their own loyalty to the national faith and the national cause was by no means above suspicion[8].

Such was the state of affairs to which Paul was returning, and it is not surprising that he foresaw the danger, and that his friends warned him of it. The Jews of the Dispersion, who had come to Jerusalem for the Passover and Pentecost, would, as they learnt of the sufferings of the nation, share the indignation of those who were actually exposed to them. They themselves would, however, have grievances of their own to relate, namely, the story of how Paul the renegade Jew was stirring up strife among the synagogues of the Dispersion[9] and turning away those of the Gentiles who were feeling their way to the true faith. Proselytes were being encouraged to forsake the Law, and moneys were being diverted which would otherwise have been contributed to the upkeep of the Temple; it was easy to pervert Paul's teaching into the doctrine that Jews themselves were at liberty

to forsake the Law and the worship of their fathers, and to refuse to recognize the claims of the national sanctuary. The notoriety of his mission at Ephesus had made him known by sight to thousands[10]. Already an attempt had been made to remove him on the journey from Corinth to Jerusalem; and though he had escaped from his enemies in Greece, there was far less opportunity for him to do so in the Holy City. It was even uncertain how far, in the present state of public opinion, the Hebrew Christians could be relied on to greet him as a friend and fellow-Christian; the violent hostility of the mass of the Jewish nation could be counted on as certain. The position was complicated by the fact that among his companions were uncircumcised converts from the Gentile Churches, whose presence would hardly be regarded with favour either by Jews or Jewish Christians[11].

Thus, although the recognized authorities of the Church of Jerusalem were prepared to stand loyally by the agreement of the Council, and although they could rely on the loyalty of the Christians of the city, they might well find it hard to restrain the zeal of converts from other parts of Judaea and Galilee who had come up for the festival[12]. Among the Jewish authorities, the Pharisaic wing of the Sanhedrin could be relied on to protect a fellow-Pharisee, and they were also opposed to any outbreak of fanaticism, which might easily culminate in a disastrous rebellion. But in spite of the popular veneration for their piety, they were rapidly losing control over the more extreme section of the nation, except in so far as they were prepared to fall in with its ambitions[13]. They could probably prevent any direct condemnation of Paul by the Sanhedrin; but they were powerless to do anything more. The sacerdotal party had every motive for hostility. They could not fail to resent a form of propaganda which threatened to diminish the Temple-revenues. The High Priest in office, Ananias, son of Nebedaeus, was in particular notorious for his unscrupulous avarice, and could be counted as a certain enemy[14]; while the bulk of the Sadducee party, especially the house of Annas, were the ancient enemies of the Church. They had every motive for avoiding any disorder that might lead to a rebellion; but they could hope to get rid of Paul by indirect means which would not compromise them in the eyes of the Roman government, but which would none the less show to the nation at large who were the party which in fact was zealous for the national faith, and so do something to restore their position, which was at the time seriously discredited by their rapacity and oppression. The murder of a Christian leader at the instigation of the High Priest might well avert for a time the

growing danger of rebellion, even though it involved the High Priest yet further in complicity with those elements in the nation from which the danger of such a rebellion came[15].

Such were the conditions at Paul's arrival. James and the elders of Jerusalem greeted him with enthusiasm. None the less, they could not be blind to the dangers that threatened him. One step, however, was possible which would at least conciliate the more hostile section among the Jewish Christians. There were in Jerusalem four members of the Church, who, combining Jewish with Christian piety after the fashion of Hebrew Christianity, had undertaken the Nazirite vow[16]. It was common for wealthy and devout Jews to assist their poorer brethren by defraying the cost of the sacrifices which the Law demanded at the fulfilment of this vow. By undertaking this burden Paul could effectively silence the charge that he was teaching apostasy from the Law, and prove his own devoutness in observing the Jewish religion. James accordingly proposed that he should act as the patron of these men—a proposal which Paul was naturally ready to accept, since it conciliated his fellow-Christians and accorded entirely with his own belief that as a Jew he was bound to observe in all things the religion of the nation. After duly performing the ritual prescribed for the occasion Paul with his four Jewish companions entered the Temple[17].

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII, SECTION II

1. *Antt.* xx. v. 3, vi; *B.J.* II. xii; Tac. *Ann.* xii. 54.

2. According to Josephus (*locc. citt.*) the dismissal of Cumanus was due to an attack by the Samaritans on Galilean pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem. Cumanus refused to do justice to the Galileans, having been bribed by the Samaritans. The Jews thereupon took up arms on behalf of their fellows under the leadership of a notorious brigand, Eleazar, son of Deinaeus. They sacked some Samaritan villages, but were attacked by Cumanus with a part of his forces and some Samaritans armed for the purpose. The Jews were defeated, and their rulers, who had been opposed to the whole rising, persuaded them to abandon it. Meanwhile both Jews and Samaritans appealed to Quadratus, who, after executing the Jews taken by Cumanus in the field, sent Jonathan the High Priest, with other Jewish leaders and the chief Samaritans, to Rome to be tried by Claudius, together with Cumanus and his second-in-command, Celer. At Rome the freedmen and friends of Claudius supported Cumanus and the Samaritans, but the Jewish side won the day owing to the intervention of the younger Agrippa and the influence of Agrippina, the wife of the Emperor. Claudius ordered the leading Samaritans to be executed at Rome, while Cumanus was banished and Celer sent back to Jerusalem to be executed there. Felix was appointed procurator of Judaea at the request of Jonathan (*Antt.* xx. viii. 5).

The entire opposition of this narrative to that of Tacitus (*Ann.* xii. 54) is a well-known difficulty. Schürer (*G.J.V.* I. 570) prefers the account of Josephus. Tacitus is certainly in error in one important point, since he represents Felix as procurator of Samaria. This he certainly was not, but it is perfectly possible that he was, temporarily at least, engaged in the administration of the Imperial estates in Palestine. The revenue of 600 talents drawn by Archelaus from his dominions (*Antt.* XVII. xi. 4) had passed on his deposition (*ib.* XVIII. i. 1) to Augustus. They

had presumably been restored to Herod Agrippa I and reverted to Claudius; it is clear that some considerable part must have been drawn from Samaria. It is therefore possible that Felix was employed in Samaria at this time in connection with the Imperial estates. For the existence of such officials in Palestine cf. the position of Herennius Capito at Jamnia in the reign of Caligula (*Antt.* XVIII. vi. 3; Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium* 30 (M. II. 575). It appears from the former passage that this official had certain troops under him intended to act as a small police force. For the fact that there were at this time in Palestine Imperial estates in the administration of which the Emperor's slaves were employed cf. the murder of one of them during the administration of Cumanus, which Josephus records.

It is therefore by no means impossible that Felix should have been employed as an Imperial agent in Samaria at this period, as Tacitus states. On the other hand, Tacitus is also clearly in error in representing Felix as supporting the Samaritans against the Jews, and the latter as being supported by Cumanus. The obvious bias of Josephus against the procurator of the province is clear proof that, whether rightly or wrongly, Cumanus took the side of the Samaritans. But the fact that Jonathan the High Priest subsequently asked that Felix might be appointed procurator is suspicious, and suggests that Felix, while holding office in Samaria, had somehow been persuaded by the Jewish authorities to support them against Cumanus, since there is no other reason for such a request. It is easy to suppose that Josephus would ignore the somewhat discreditable connection between the Jews and Felix at the outset of the quarrel, since the object of this part of his narrative is to emphasize the fact that the blame for the provocation of Jewish feeling during the period preceding the revolt rests on the misgovernment of the Roman authorities and not on the Jewish nation as a whole. Further, he mentions that the friends and freedmen of Claudius supported Cumanus against the Jews, who were assisted by Herod Agrippa. There seems no obvious reason for their attitude, and it also seems improbable that the influence of Herod would have been strong enough to win the day. If, on the other hand, Felix was in fact involved, it is quite natural to suppose that the support for Cumanus was due to an intrigue in the Imperial household against Pallas and his brother, and that it was they rather than Herod who in fact won the day for the Jews against the rest of the Imperial household.

The only difficulty is to explain the employment of Felix as procurator of the Imperial estates in Samaria. Even though his duties may have extended over the whole of the Imperial estates in Palestine, the post seems rather a small one for the brother of Pallas. On the other hand, it is difficult to reject entirely the very circumstantial narrative of Tacitus as to the treatment of Cumanus and Felix by Quadratus, while the inaccuracies noted above deal only with minor details of a character which Tacitus would hardly trouble to verify. To reject either his narrative or that of Josephus is a counsel of despair, which it is difficult to follow, so long as any reconciliation of the two is possible.

3. For the career of Felix as procurator of Palestine cf. *Antt.* XX. vii. 1–viii. 5–8; *B.J.* II. xiii; Tac. *Hist.* v. 9.

4. For the date cf. *G.J.V.* I. 573. It is difficult to judge how far the incident was likely to arouse the hostility of the Jews, but the marriage was entirely contrary to Jewish Law, and would hardly conciliate the nation. (For its illegality cf. *Antt.* XX. vii. 2, and above, c. I. n. 50.) It is probable that it was one of the minor grievances which produced the general irritation against the Roman government to which the rebellion owed its origin.

5. For the incidents recorded in the text cf. the references to Josephus in n. 3, and for the Egyptian also Acts xxi. 38. It may be noted that according to Josephus, in *B.J.* II. xiii. 5, the number of his adherents amounted to 30,000! S. Luke's 4000 is a more reasonable figure.

6. *B.J.* II. xiii. 6.

7. Acts xxi. 20; for the effect on the Jewish Christians of Palestine of the revolutionary Messianic agitations of the period cf. c. III. § ii. n. 21.

8. For the attitude of the popular and patriotic party to the Church in Palestine cf. c. V. § ii. n. 18. The fact that the Christians did not regard the Jewish Law as the final revelation of God, and added their own system to it as necessary, and their refusal to take part in any violent movement for the deliverance of the nation, rendered them unpopular with their zealot compatriots; and they would naturally resent

S. Paul's attitude towards the Gentiles, which could be alleged as justifying the suspicions entertained in such quarters as to their own enthusiasm for the Law.

9. Cf. c. VII. § ii. n. 21. The charge brought against S. Paul in Acts xxiv. 5 is a combination of the desire of the Sadducees to justify their patriotism in the eyes of the nation as a whole by persecuting the sect of the Nazarenes, and throwing the responsibility for their failure to do so on the Roman authorities, with the grievance of the authorities of the Jewish synagogues of the Dispersion against the growth of Christian propaganda outside Palestine. Naturally neither of these charges would carry any weight before a Roman tribunal, and hence the more serious charge of profaning the Temple is thrown in. S. Paul's answer is to admit that he follows the doctrines of the sect of the Nazarenes, but that these doctrines are demonstrably a legitimate form of Judaism. As regards the charge that he stirs up factions among the Jews of the Dispersion, he replies that in fact the object of his visit was to bring alms for the benefit of the people. The charge of profaning the Temple breaks down through lack of evidence, the Jews responsible in the first instance for the disturbance being presumably afraid to offer their testimony in the Roman court.

10. The attempt on S. Paul's life on the occasion of his departure from Corinth, the continued warnings of the danger awaiting him at Jerusalem, and the fact that the attack on him in the city proceeds from the Jews of Asia, are evidence of the notoriety he had gained during his most recent mission.

11. Acts xxi. 29, from which it is clear that Trophimus was in fact uncircumcised. Otherwise S. Luke would have written that they supposed him to be uncircumcised, not that they supposed him to have been brought into the Temple.

12. Acts xxi. 20. It is to be presumed that the Church of Jerusalem would obey S. James and the presbyters. The *μυριάδες* of Christians (in any case the phrase looks like an exaggeration; it is hard to suppose that there were even 20,000 Hebrew Christians) are presumably composed to a large extent of converts from the outlying regions of Judaea and Galilee, who might be less amenable to the control of the Church of Jerusalem.

13. For the attitude of the Pharisees see Acts xxiii. 6, and cf. c. I. n. 8, c. III. § ii. n. 36. That they were losing hold of the nation at the time is shown by their inability to secure S. Paul's acquittal by the Sanhedrin, and their subsequent failure to protect S. James the Lord's brother.

14. For his character cf. *Antt.* xx. ix. 2.

15. Cf. c. V. § ii. n. 18. The plot of Acts xxiii. 12 *seqq.* and the connivance of the Sadducean element in the Sanhedrin are entirely in harmony with the relations of Ananias with the *sicarii* in *Antt.* xx. ix. 3. His complicity with them naturally rendered him liable to blackmail at their hands.

16. Cf. c. VI. § v. n. 49.

17. From this point the career of S. Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles enters on a new phase, while his relations with the Church of Jerusalem come to an end, so far as our evidence goes. The narrative of his trials before Felix and Festus is obviously intended to show that Christianity had been triumphantly vindicated in the only Roman courts where it could hope for a fair hearing: apart from details already noted it is therefore outside the scope of this book. It might seem more natural to carry on the record of his career as far as his arrival in Rome. This would, however, necessitate a consideration of the questions connected with the later Pauline Epistles, some of which, if genuine, may well have been written during the period of his imprisonment at Caesarea. Moreover, the point at which the Acts conclude is purely arbitrary. It is difficult to suppose that S. Luke intended this to be the close of his narrative; at the time when he finished the book he must have hoped to add a third volume which would have had for its material the ministry of S. Paul (and S. Peter) at Rome, the martyrdom of the two Apostles (with a speech of S. Paul before Nero), the martyrdom of S. James the Lord's brother, and the fall of Jerusalem. It must be remembered that it is probable that there was a further period of missionary activity on the part of S. Paul to be narrated as well. An extension of the narrative of this book beyond the present point would involve the consideration of a large number of fresh problems without avoiding the drawback of an arbitrary conclusion, unless it were extended up to the end of S. Paul's lifetime.

APPENDIX I

THE APOSTOLATE

THE use of the term "Apostle" in the Lucan and Pauline writings begins with Lk. vi. 13, where not only the choice of the Twelve, but their description by the title of Apostles is ascribed to Our Lord Himself. The parallel account in Mt. x. 2 applies the title to the Twelve without implying that it was given to them by Our Lord. It is probable that in this case S. Luke has ascribed to Our Lord the institution of the title which was later adopted by the Church, as he has probably done in the case of the presbyters of Jerusalem (see c. v. § ii. n. 33). The view that the number of Apostles is confined to Twelve, and that there can be neither more nor less, appears in Acts i. 2 *seqq.*, and apparently also in xii. 17, where the name of James the Lord's brother appears for the first time. He had indeed held a position at Jerusalem which was more or less equivalent to that of the Twelve at an earlier date; but the fact that there is no mention of him before this in the Acts, and that from this time onwards he appears as the Apostolic ruler of the community in Jerusalem, seems to indicate that S. Luke regards him as attaining to this position at this moment in view of the vacancy in the college of Twelve caused by the death of S. James the son of Zebedee (see c. v. § ii. n. 26 and c. iii. § ii. n. 36. It appears from Gal. i. 19 that S. James the Lord's brother held an Apostolic position in Jerusalem as early as A.D. 38, whereas the mention of him in Acts refers to A.D. 41). It is quite reasonable to suppose that his formal recognition as "Apostle of Jerusalem" dates from this moment (cf. c. v. § ii. n. 21).

Later, however, S. Luke admits the existence of other Apostles. In Acts xiv. 14 the title is applied to SS. Paul and Barnabas. The exact nature of their claim to the title is confused by the fact that S. Luke has described their journey as preceded by a service of prayer and imposition of hands, which has been interpreted, in the light of subsequent practice, as their "consecration" to the Apostolate. On the other hand they have already been acting as Apostles at Antioch for some years, and it is difficult to see what title to consideration the action of the Church at Antioch would give them in the eyes of the Jewish opponents whom S. Luke has in view throughout his narrative. It is more natural to see their formal title to the Apostolate in the commissions given to them (ἐξαπέστειλαν) by the Church of Jerusalem in ix. 30 and xi. 22 (cf. c. iv. § i. n. 63). [It is interesting to note that the mission of Judas Barsabbas and Silas to Antioch in Acts xv is never described by this word. In view of the fact that S. Luke has been careful to dissociate the mission of these two from the subsequent journey of Paul and Silas (see c. vi. § iii. n. 5), it is natural to regard his avoidance of the term as deliberate. However important the mission might be, it was not a solemn commission to engage in Apostolic activity,

but only a temporary mission to Antioch for a specific purpose. In other words it cannot be regarded as the basis of S. Paul's claim to possess any authority for his subsequent journey—a claim which S. Luke is anxious at this point to make good, as against opponents who have argued that in fact S. Paul only possessed the right to carry the decrees of the Council to Galatia with Silas, as a necessary extension of the work of the delegates sent to Antioch, and that his subsequent proceedings had no claim to Apostolic authority at all. Just as S. Luke meets this criticism by emphasizing the complete independence of the journey from the mission to Antioch, so he denies by his avoidance of the word ἐξαποστέλλω that the latter was in any sense an Apostolic mission.]

Further than this S. Luke does not go. The Apostles are the original Twelve, with Matthias and James the Lord's brother substituted for Judas and James the son of Zebedee, and SS. Paul and Barnabas. These two have direct commissions from the Church of Jerusalem; but they have higher claims. Both have associated with the Twelve on equal terms at Jerusalem, S. Barnabas in virtue of his high position in the early life of the Church in the city, S. Paul in virtue of the circumstances of his conversion (Acts iv. 36, ix. 27). Silas is never given the title of an Apostle, while the Apostolic colleague of S. Paul's journey to Ephesus is entirely ignored (c. VII. § i. n. 27). It would be natural to infer from the Acts that in fact the title was confined to the Twelve, and only extended to SS. Paul and Barnabas in virtue of their peculiar personal eminence. Any such view breaks down as soon as we turn to the Pauline Epistles. In these, besides the writer, S. Barnabas and S. James the Lord's brother, we find in 2 Cor. viii. 23 two leading Christians who are "Apostles of Churches." One of these is the colleague of S. Paul's journey; the other an old companion of S. Paul in missionary work, of whose identity we have no trace; possibly his association with S. Paul dated from his labours in Antioch and Cilicia. In Ro. xvi. 7 we meet with two more, Andronicus and Junias, who are "of note among the Apostles." On the other hand, although we have thus eighteen persons described as Apostles, S. Paul does not use the title indiscriminately of Christian evangelists of high standing. Thus in 2 Cor. viii. 23 he distinguishes Titus rather carefully from the two "Apostles" who accompany him, although Titus is really the most important of the three. Similarly, in 2 Cor. i. 1, Timothy is obviously distinguished from S. Paul as not being an Apostle, as is Sosthenes in 1 i. 1; the latter distinction is natural, as Sosthenes is probably a recent convert, but Timothy has already been a colleague of S. Paul for some five years, while Titus has been with him for eight years at least, if not longer, when 2 Cor. is written. Clearly the title is not one which can be indiscriminately employed.

The most interesting passage is however 1 Cor. xv. 5–7. Here we have a distinction between appearances of Our Lord after His Resurrection to the Twelve and to "all the Apostles." The passage is important, since it shows that the title of "the Twelve" was used in an almost technical sense; for the appearance of Our Lord in question was in fact vouchsafed to the eleven survivors of the original Twelve, whom S. Paul describes as "the Twelve," out of familiarity with the title. But its survival as a familiar title is only explicable on the ground that it was necessary to distinguish them from the rest of a group of people who might for one reason or another be termed Apostles. The distinction between a strict use of the term as applied to the Twelve and a wider body is confirmed by 2 Cor. xi. 5 and xii. 11. Here S. Paul claims on the ground of his labours to be as good as the ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι, the Apostles *par excellence*. The phrase has a satirical sound, and would seem to be a parody of some more respectful phrase intended to distinguish the Twelve from other "Apostles," who, whatever their eminence, had not the same right to the name as the members of the original college. It appears from xi. 13 that some of the Jewish opponents against whom S. Paul is writing were themselves entitled to use the name in its wider sense; the language would be pointless, if S. Paul's opponents were not in fact describing themselves as Apostles.

This fact enables us to make an important step forward. S. Paul's opponents claim to be Apostles, and so does he. But in the comparison of his claims with theirs which follows in *vv.* 21 *seqq.*, he nowhere argues that he has any better claim to be an Apostle than they have. Had there been any ground on which he could claim such superiority in regard to his position as an Apostle it is impossible to suppose that he would have failed to do so. As it is, it seems clear that so far as any formal grounds are concerned his opponents could claim to be just as good Apostles as he could himself.

Nor is this surprising when we consider the nature of his own claim. His claim is that he has seen the Lord (1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8), and that the circumstances in which he saw the Lord were such as to convey a direct divine call to the Apostolate (Gal. i. 1). Incidentally he admits that there was something abnormal about the time of his call; Our Lord appeared to him last of all and ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι. The words can only mean that something had occurred which made a call of a normal kind impossible. In fact his main claim to the Apostolate rested on the vision which caused his conversion and on nothing else, in so far as he claimed for it a divine origin. That claim had indeed been recognized by the rest of the Apostles on two occasions through the action of some of their leading members; but S. Paul entirely refuses to base his claim on that recognition; his call was not human in its origin, nor yet was it mediated through any human agency.

The claim was clearly a sweeping one; and it was one which he could only make good by justifying it in practice. Hence in upholding it he is bound to appeal to the marks of divine approval which have accompanied his labours (Acts xv. 12, Ro. xv. 18, 1 Cor. ix. 1 *seqq.*, 2 xii. 11).

As against this claim his opponents could urge that any of those who were styled Apostles in the looser sense, *i.e.* who were Apostles though not of the Twelve, had precisely the same claim as he had. The language of 1 Cor. xv. 6–8 shows that the mere fact of having seen Our Lord after His Resurrection was not enough to make an Apostle; the five hundred brethren to whom the Lord appeared at once are distinct from "all the Apostles," just as "all the Apostles" are different from the Twelve. It appears then that there was a belief in the earliest community that Our Lord had on some occasion appeared to a group of His followers larger than the Twelve and given them some charge in virtue of which all the members of that group could claim to be Apostles. Apparently this tradition underlies the narrative of Lk. xxiv. 36, where Our Lord appears to "the eleven and those that were with them" and gives this group a charge to bear witness to His death and Resurrection. It is irrelevant for our present purpose whether S. Luke has any independent authority for this part of his narrative or whether he simply gives a dramatic account of the tradition which underlies the Pauline account of the Resurrection appearances; it is clear that the Pauline narrative implies an appearance to a wider group than the Twelve, which gave those present a claim to call themselves Apostles. Thus in this respect of direct authority from Our Lord there were several besides S. Paul who could claim it as the ground of their Apostolate; and some of them seem to have been among his opponents at Corinth. He could only claim to be their superior and the equal of the Twelve in this respect on the strength of a more important position conferred on him by his vision at the time of his conversion, to which he was the sole witness, or on the strength of the results achieved by his labours; and it is to these claims that he does appeal.

In view of this difficulty it might seem surprising that he should not appeal to the fact of his recognition by the leading members of the Twelve as evidence of his superiority to those other "Apostles," who claimed to be his equals. He appeals in Gal. ii to their recognition of his Apostolate to the Gentiles as evidence of their acceptance of his teaching on the relation of the Gospel to the Law; but he has already emphatically refused to base his claim to the Apostolate on that recognition. S. Luke, on the other hand, by his use of the word ἐξαποστέλλω, seems inclined to urge that the original authority of SS. Paul and Barnabas in the Church was confirmed by their missions to Antioch and Tarsus in such a way as to render all doubt of their Apostolate impossible.

It may be observed that in any case it is doubtful whether the mission of S. Barnabas was in fact such that it could be regarded as an "Apostolic" mission (cf. c. v. § i. nn. 11, 15 *seqq.*). Nor can we feel very certain as to the exact nature of S. Paul's authority to preach at Tarsus. The narrative of the Acts here is not entirely reliable (c. iv. § i. n. 46), and S. Paul makes no mention of any special authority received on this occasion in Gal. i. 19. No doubt his journey to Tarsus was preceded by a solemn form of prayer (probably accompanied by an imposition of hands), and no doubt his journey to Tarsus had the full approval of the Christians at Jerusalem; but it is important to inquire whether this was sufficient to justify S. Paul in basing on it any claim to Apostolic authority, and if so, whether the authority conveyed was of the higher or the lower kind, *i.e.* whether it was sufficient to make him the equal of the Twelve, or whether it merely gave him the title of an Apostle in the wider sense in which S. Paul uses it of others besides himself.

On this point our information is too scanty to allow of a certain conclusion. S. Luke avoids the whole question of the two kinds of Apostolic authority by restricting the title to SS. Paul and Barnabas and the Twelve; thus while he hints that the former two had ample authority for their claim to be Apostles in so far as human authority was necessary, he neither asserts nor denies that such authority is in fact needed, nor does he either assert or deny the existence of other Apostles with equal authority on this ground. There are, however, certain indications that S. Paul is familiar with the conception that the authority of the Church is considered, at least in some cases, as necessary for the Apostolate. Thus in Gal. i. 1 his vigorous repudiation of the idea that he is an Apostle "from men or through men" reads very much like a denial of an allegation that his claim to the Apostolate rests on his recognition by the Church. Similarly, his Jewish opponents at Corinth have letters of recommendation, the mere mention of which causes his mind to revert to the claim that it is the success of his work which is in the last resort the justification of his Apostolate. This suggests that his opponents base their claim to be Apostles on the fact that they possess letters of commendation from the Church of Jerusalem in which they are so styled. The evidence suggests rather strongly that the claim to a secondary Apostolate was connected with the idea of a direct commission from the Church, which entitled its holder to regard himself as an Apostle (cf. ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν in 2 Cor. viii. 23). Such a commission S. Paul in fact possessed. But even if it entitled him to exercise a general Apostolate wherever he wished, and not merely at Tarsus, there is no reason to suppose that at the time of his departure from Jerusalem for Cilicia there was any discussion of the question of the exact nature of the commission given him, or of the extent to which it

entitled him to regard himself as the equal of the Twelve. Even on the occasion of the famine-visit it seems likely that the older Apostles did not envisage the prospect of an extended campaign among the Gentiles, but regarded Gentile Christianity as confined to a few communities in Syria and Cilicia (c. v. § iii. n. 23).

This explanation meets the difficulty noted above as to S. Paul's refusal to appeal to the Apostolic authority given to him by the recognition of the Church. In this respect, as in that of having seen the Lord, he was in exactly the same position as his opponents. He possessed a general title conferred by the Church to preach the Gospel, but they possessed a precisely similar one. If this suggestion is correct, it would seem that the title to the secondary Apostolate was either confined to those who had seen the Lord on the occasion referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 7 and had also been commissioned to undertake Apostolic activity on some specific occasion, or that the giving of a formal Apostolic commission was introduced when it became necessary to employ on important and independent missions persons who had not been present on that particular occasion. Whether any commission was given by the Church to those who had received the charge given by Our Lord to "all the Apostles" or only to other Christians later employed in "Apostolic" activities is not clear: the latter is perhaps more probable. If the number then present was comparatively small it would soon become necessary to add to them others who could be entrusted with such tasks, and an ecclesiastical ceremony would be employed to compensate for the lack of a direct divine commission. (For the circumstances in which the necessity originally arose cf. c. III. § ii.)

Thus in fact the only grounds on which S. Paul could claim to be an Apostle were those which he shared with his opponents. His only claim to superiority lay in the infinitely greater scope and success of his work, a dangerous ground in dealing with the Corinthians who were already fatally willing to assume that the power to produce abnormal spiritual manifestations was the sole test of eminence in the Church. In order to lessen the difficulty S. Paul minimizes the distinction between the Twelve and other Apostles by the sarcastic phrase of 2 Cor. xi. 5, though he admits it in 1 Cor. xv. 7. It is indeed probable that the distinction between the Twelve and other Apostles only developed with the growth of the Church and the consequent growth in the number of those to whom the name was applied. The persons present when Our Lord gave the command to teach, from whom the first Apostles not of the Twelve were chosen, were probably not called by the title at first, but only when they were gradually absorbed in Apostolic activities; and it would only be when there were a large number of secondary Apostles that the difference between them and the Twelve would be felt. It would seem that at the time when S. Paul first

left for Tarsus, he was regarded as an Apostle and more or less the equal of the Twelve; it was only later that the distinction came to be felt, and by that time it was clear that formally S. Paul belonged to the secondary class, and could only claim superiority on the grounds of his personal success.

It may be observed that the persons described as Apostles in this secondary sense would not appear to have been regarded as enjoying a position at all comparable to that of the Twelve. Thus they could not claim to be supported by their converts as the Twelve could, and S. Paul's refusal to demand such support was used by his opponents to prove that he was himself conscious of his inferiority to the Twelve (1 Cor. ix. 4 *seqq.*). The origin of this distinction is easy to understand. Owing to the circumstances in which Christianity was diffused in Palestine, the first missionaries were not as a rule the Twelve, but individual Christians, in the first instance refugees from the persecution which followed the death of S. Stephen and later others who for one reason or another had left Jerusalem, but were not definitely sent by the Church to preach the Gospel. It is not till S. Paul's journey to Tarsus that we find any instance in which a Christian is sent out with this deliberate purpose. It is indeed possible that all the Christian teachers described as Apostles who are not of the Twelve were sent out in the same way to preach the Gospel; certainly it is natural to suppose that Andronicus and Junias were sent in this way to Rome from Antioch. It has however been seen above that the title was probably applied in the first instance to any Christian with certain qualifications either of having seen the Lord on a particular occasion, or of having received specific authority to act on behalf of the Church (*i.e.* the community in Jerusalem). Naturally those who proceeded to regions where the Gospel had never been preached, would not immediately demand the support of their converts, a demand which would inevitably expose them to suspicion. Similarly it is reasonable to suppose that emissaries sent from Jerusalem for some specific purpose would be provided with funds by those who sent them. Thus they would not need to demand support from those whom they visited. On the other hand the Twelve were sent out from Jerusalem to supervise the growth of communities already founded, and it was only reasonable that those whom they visited should assist their teachers; moreover the Twelve, travelling in the manner originally enjoined by Our Lord (Mk vi. 7) and able to testify to their personal knowledge of Him, would enjoy a prestige which in Palestine would normally enable them to rise above any possible suspicion. (It must be remembered that S. Paul's opponents are Hebrews who habitually think in terms of Palestine and make no allowance for the necessity of changing the methods suitable for dealing with Palestine when attempting

to evangelize the world.) S. Paul on his journeys could not demand support in this way; but his failure to do so rendered it easy to depreciate his position. The injunctions of the *Didache* (xi. 3) probably represent quite accurately the situation that arose among the Palestinian communities at the close of the Apostolic age, when there were a number of persons with some claim to be called Apostles, as well as a large number of false Apostles, the former expecting some assistance from communities through which they passed as a continuation of the practice of the original Twelve whom they had succeeded, the latter hoping to obtain it by fraud. The gradual disappearance of the original Twelve was bound to leave a great uncertainty as to who was or was not an "Apostle," an uncertainty which was increased by the fact that their places were at first filled by other Christians who had played an almost equally important part in the early life of the Church. An instance of this is to be found in the stories of S. Philip the Evangelist, who is stated by Polycrates (*H.E.* iii. 31) to be buried with two of his daughters at Hierapolis. The same story is found in Papias. Both writers describe him as "the Apostle." But the allusion to his daughters shows that Philip "the Evangelist, one of the Seven," is meant. Now it is hardly possible to identify the Philip of Acts viii. and xxi. 8 with the Philip who appears among the Twelve; and it follows that "Philip the Apostle" of Hierapolis is in fact the deacon and Evangelist of Acts. The confusion, however, is natural so soon as we realize that in fact Philip the Evangelist probably was an "Apostle" when he went to Hierapolis, and that by the time of Papias the distinction between two classes of Apostles had almost been lost. It was however still remembered when the Acts were written; hence S. Luke never refers to S. Paul and Silas together as Apostles, since by doing so he would have implied that the two were only Apostles in the same sense; and he omits all reference to S. Paul's Apostolic colleague on his third journey. On the other hand he describes SS. Paul and Barnabas as "Apostles" since the actual position of S. Barnabas was so high that S. Paul's association with him tended to increase his dignity.

Even apart from the direct evidence of 2 Cor. viii. 19 (for which cf. c. VII. § i. n. 27) it would be safe to assume that S. Paul had such a colleague. We find him with such colleagues on his two earlier journeys, and it would clearly be contrary to his interests to go alone on this occasion. Apart from the obvious convenience of having a colleague who could give independent testimony to the teachings of Christianity and carry on the work if he was incapacitated by illness, it would have been the height of foolishness for S. Paul to invite criticism from his opponents among the Hebrew Christians by going alone. For it was the recognized rule of the Church in Palestine that the Apostles should work in couples. The practice went back to Our Lord Himself (Mk vi. 7). The evidence available for the

first period of Christianity shows that it was continued. The list of Acts i. 13 divides the Twelve into couples, and it is to be observed that it shows a remarkable variation from the earlier lists of the Gospels. Both in Mt. x. 2 and Lk. vi. 14 S. Peter is coupled with his brother, and the two sons of Zebedee are also joined together. In the Acts S. Peter is coupled with S. John and S. Andrew with S. James. This arrangement is confirmed by Acts iii. 1 and viii. 14, and these two passages are again confirmed by Gal. ii. 9. Although S. Peter appears alone on several occasions this is only natural in view of the fact that he enjoys a recognized personal pre-eminence; the fact that he appears on three occasions with S. John, when supported by the practice of S. Paul on his journeys and the action of S. Barnabas in securing S. Paul for his colleague at Antioch (cf. c. v. § i. n. 16), is clear evidence that Apostles were normally expected to work in couples (cf. also Acts xv. 22).

That the sending out of an Apostolic mission was usually preceded by a solemn imposition of hands (at any rate where the persons sent were not members of the original Twelve) may be regarded as reasonably certain in view of Acts xiii. 3. It is possible indeed that S. Luke mentions the incident as a kind of added testimony to S. Paul's Apostolic position, although it is strictly incompatible with his own view that the Apostolic authority of SS. Paul and Barnabas dates from the first commissions received by them from the Church of Jerusalem, if indeed he regards any ecclesiastical authority as necessary (see above). S. Paul would himself have denied that his Apostolic authority was due to either incident. It is therefore more natural to see in the ceremony of Acts xiii. 3 a typical scene at the outset of a mission. The imposition of hands is in this case to be regarded as a solemn farewell blessing, which conveys the authority of the community for the work to be undertaken. The use of the ceremony was a natural extension of the O.T. practice of blessing in this manner (Gen. xlviii. 14, as amplified in Deut. xxxiv. 9), possibly influenced by the use of the same form for consecrating Levites in Numbers viii. 10, where the idea of separation suits the command of the Holy Ghost that the two Apostles are to be "separated" for a particular work. The ceremony was indeed used for the admission of new members of the Sanhedrin, and for the raising of the pupil of a rabbi to be a rabbi himself (cf. *Hor. Hebr.* on this passage), and from this point of view it would be natural to see in the ceremony a "consecration" to the Apostolate; but it is more probable, in view of the attitude of S. Luke and S. Paul on the origin of S. Paul's claims in the matter, to suppose that the ceremony here was intended as a solemn blessing for the new work, and that it was commonly used in sending out emissaries for any important mission.

APPENDIX II

THE PRIMITIVE EUCHARIST

In Acts ii. 42 and 46 we have accounts of the life of the first Christians immediately after the first general appeal of the Apostles to the public in Jerusalem. In the former passage they are described as persevering in the breaking of bread and in prayers; in the latter as persevering by day in the Temple with one accord and breaking bread at home, *i.e.* apparently in groups organized for the purpose in various houses belonging to fairly wealthy converts. The new society is organized on a communistic basis; but otherwise, according to the latter passage, it adheres externally to the traditional forms of Jewish piety. The breaking of bread is, on one side at any rate, simply the common meal of the society, and there is nothing in it to offend Jewish susceptibilities. None the less the two passages together clearly show that it is a definite part of the religious life of the Church, not merely a common meal. Thus in *v.* 42, where the writer or his source of information is describing the difference between the new society and the orthodox Jews, the breaking of bread comes first; in *v.* 46 it is placed second, since the point to be emphasized is the continuity of the Church with the worship of Judaism.

The breaking of bread recurs in connection with Christian worship in Acts xx. 7. Here the community at Troas meets on Sunday (*i.e.* at 6 p.m. on Saturday or about that time). The meeting opens with a lengthy discourse by S. Paul, after which the "breaking of bread" in the proper sense takes place. It is followed by social intercourse (this seems to be the meaning of ὁμιλήσας), which lasts till daybreak, when S. Paul is due to start. It is unsafe to assume that the scene is in all respects typical; S. Paul is taking a last farewell of his converts at Troas. Hence it is probable that the all-night sitting is an exceptional matter, as also the length of his speech. Here the language would be consistent with the view that the phrase "breaking bread" refers merely to a meal with no religious significance; but the wording of Acts ii. 42 and 46 clearly refers to a religious meal, and the recurrence of the technical phrase κλάσαι ἄρτον is decisive evidence that the meal was, in part at least, of a religious character, although it seems to be followed by general social intercourse.

A more detailed picture of the common meal of the primitive Church can be inferred from 1 Cor. xi. 17 *seqq.* Here S. Paul is blaming the Corinthians for the disorders that attend the eating of the "Lord's Supper." The converts, instead of coming together for a common meal, to which each contributes his share, bring their own private meals and eat them as soon as they arrive. The result is that the rich have more than they

need, while the poor get little or nothing; there is no common meal in the proper sense. S. Paul goes on to ascribe the origin of these common meals to the Last Supper of Our Lord before the Crucifixion. It is clearly implied that at some point in the meal, as celebrated at Corinth, there is a solemn commemoration of the words in which Our Lord gave the Bread and the Cup to His disciples, and that after this commemoration the Bread and Cup are received by those present. In eating and drinking them those present show forth the Lord's death until His Second Coming, and in receiving them unworthily they make themselves guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. [This last phrase is a peculiar one; it seems to be due to an attempt to combine the circumstances of the Eucharist with the phrase ἔνοχος τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου, which could be used quite easily to mean "guilty of the murder of the Lord." The phrase is the natural antithesis of Pilate's in Mt. xxvii. 24; cf. τὸν ἱεροσυλίας ἔνοχον in 2 Macc. xiii. 6. The Pauline adaptation of the words is natural in the circumstances.] The Corinthians are told to wait for the common meal until all are assembled; if they are too hungry to do so, they can eat at home before they come. The recommendations are significant. It is scarcely likely that the disorders that had arisen were merely due to the unwillingness of the wealthier converts to provide food for their poorer brethren; if this were the reason it would be natural for S. Paul to condemn them for their meanness. It seems more natural to suppose that the richer converts could arrive more punctually than the poorer, and that they were unwilling to wait until all were assembled. Hence they began their own meal at once, the result being that the poorer brethren on their arrival found nothing left, or had no time to eat it. The explanation of the hurry of those who arrive first may be found in the chapters which follow. The Corinthians are unduly devoted to the cultivation and display of spiritual gifts, which accompany the public meetings of the Church, of which the chief, if not the only one regularly attended by all Christians, is that on the first day of the week (xvi. 2). The common meal is the first incident in these meetings, and the Corinthians are anxious to finish it in order to get on to the more exciting parts of the meeting at which they can revel in spiritual manifestations. These follow the actual commemoration of the scene at the Last Supper, or possibly they actually accompany it. (It is probable that xiv. 16 refers to the prayers which accompany the commemoration of the Last Supper; so in Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 65) the president utters extempore prayers, and the people reply Amen. Similarly in the *Didache* the answer Amen is added to the formal eucharistic prayers provided, while prophets are allowed to use such prayers as they may be inspired to utter (x. 6, 7); it may be presumed that the people would reply Amen to such prayers.) Hence it seems that at Corinth the prayers accompanying the Eucharist

might take, at least in part, the form of speaking with tongues; in any case the meeting which succeeded the Eucharist would be the normal opportunity for the display of these gifts, and, if so, it would seem that the main motive for the disorderly proceedings at Corinth was the desire of those who arrived first to finish the meal and begin the more stimulating part of Christian worship.

As illustrating S. Paul's view of the nature of this eucharistic rite, it is necessary to note that it is analogous in some way both to the sacrifices of the Old Law and to those of the heathen (1 Cor. x. 16 *seqq.*). It is a partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, in virtue of which the many who partake of the one Bread of the rite are themselves united into one loaf or one body, just as in the old religion of Israel the eating of the sacrificial meals was a bond which united the members of the nation as sharers in the altar of the one true God, and *ipso facto* excluded them from participation in any other form of sacrificial worship. This is apparently the point of the argument; it is left somewhat obscure by S. Paul's assumption that his readers are familiar with the idea that the religious unity of Israel rests on a system of worship, which is on the one side an internal bond of union between all followers of the one true God, and on the other hand an absolute barrier against any community between them and those who follow other gods. A similar argument underlies Heb. xiii. 10 and Ignatius, *Ad Eph.* v. 2. It is properly a Jewish argument against idolatry; the worship of the Temple unites the Jews and separates them from the heathen. It has been transferred to the Eucharist, but as used here the argument by itself does not meet its purpose, since the Corinthians would not necessarily assume that such an unity excluded them from any share in other cults. S. Paul, however, does not develop this line of thought, but breaks off into a direct attack on Gentile cults. The idols of the Gentiles may be nonentities; but this does not prove, as apparently some of the Corinthians argued, that there could be no harm in worshipping them; for the worship of the Gentiles is offered not to the true God but to devils; and it is obviously impossible to partake both of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils. Here S. Paul is hampered by the fact that the Jews alternated between the view that the idols of the heathen were nonentities to be ridiculed and the view that there were behind them directly evil beings of a spiritual nature opposed to God (cf. c. IV. § i. n. 13). The importance of the whole passage lies in the fact that S. Paul sees in the Eucharist a rite in which the partaking of, or communion with, the Body and Blood of Christ is the bond which unites all Christians, just as the system of the Temple-sacrifices was the bond which united the Jewish nation; it also rendered impossible any share in the worship of false gods, just as the right to partake in the one altar of Jerusalem

excluded all worship of false gods. (For the latter thought cf. Lev. xvii. 7; for the position of the Temple as the centre of Jewish nationality Philo, *De Mon.* ii. 1, M. II. 223.) It may be noted that the whole argument would have been simplified enormously if S. Paul had been able to say of Judaism that partaking in the sacrifices was a form of communion with the one true God; but the idea was alien to the Jewish religion in its historical development.

Now the whole of S. Paul's language assumes that the association of the Eucharist with the scene at the Last Supper is familiar to the Corinthians. The worship of the Church consists of a common meal at the end of which there is a solemn blessing or consecration of bread and wine. It is not clear whether this ceremony is accompanied in all cases by the recital of the narrative of the Last Supper and the words of institution, or whether such a recital is, at least in some cases, replaced by spiritual utterances of the kind criticized in the following chapters; possibly the spiritual utterances are added to the formal words and do not replace them. In any case the association of the eucharistic conclusion of the common meal with the Last Supper is understood, even if it is not in all cases clearly stated. The preceding meal ought itself to be regarded as a solemn act of religion, a point which the Corinthians have tended to forget. There is a slight difference here from the scene at Troas, where the Eucharist, and apparently the common meal, follow the long discourse by S. Paul; but this is hardly important. It is possible that the common meal occurred at the beginning of the meeting, and that S. Paul's discourse took the form of a prolonged eucharistic prayer and sermon, on the lines of the utterances noted above, culminating in the Eucharist. Further it is to be noted that this rite of a common meal, followed by a solemn act of breaking of bread, accompanied by prayers and discourses, suits the account given in Acts ii. 42 and 46 of the life of the first Christian community at Jerusalem. The meal is indeed the principal daily meal of the Christians, but it is also the act of worship which differentiates the new movement from the old system of Judaism.

Now in itself there is nothing surprising in the use of a meal by the Christians of Jerusalem as an act of worship. The idea was already familiar to Judaism. The ordinary Jewish meal was accompanied by solemn forms of prayer and thanksgiving, and it would be easy to amplify these in such a way as to make the religious aspect of the meal the predominant one. The meals of the Essenes as described in *B.J.* II. viii. 5 show a close similarity to what appears to be the first Christian practice in a body which in certain external features may be regarded as a sect of Judaism closely resembling the primitive Church. The Therapeutae described by Philo in *De Vit. Cont.* furnish an obvious parallel.

On the other hand S. Paul's doctrinal interpretation of the Eucharist in

its relation to the Last Supper is not so easy. There is nothing in Jewish literature which provides any parallel for the conception of a ritual meal in which bread and wine are made the means by which the believers are able to enter into communion with the life of the deity. Further, it is to be noted that the command to continue a dramatic representation of the scene of the Last Supper only appears in 1 Cor. and S. Luke's Gospel, which may naturally have been influenced by S. Paul. S. Mark and S. Matthew make no mention of any command on the part of Our Lord that the scene should be repeated. Moreover S. Paul claims to have received his knowledge of the rite from Our Lord Himself, a phrase which might imply that he has in fact introduced the story of the Last Supper as a part of the common meal on the strength of what he rightly or wrongly regards as a direct divine revelation, or even that the whole story of the Last Supper rests on such a foundation only and has in fact no historical basis. The introduction of the belief that the Bread and Wine furnished a mysterious means of communion with Our Lord, which could be described as a partaking of His Body and Blood, might then be explained as due to the introduction by S. Paul of conceptions borrowed from heathen sources, in which the idea of a ritual meal as a means of entering into communion with the life of the deity was not uncommon (cf. Kennedy, *S. Paul and the Mystery-Religions* for evidence on this point. There was, according to Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 66), a meal resembling the Eucharist in the mysteries of Mithras; but these mysteries, although older in their origin than Christianity, would not appear to have penetrated to the West as early as the time of S. Paul. In any case the appearance of a sacramental meal of bread and wine in both religions might easily be due to accident, or even, in view of the syncretistic tendencies of Hellenistic religion, to a borrowing by Mithraism from Christianity. The cult of Mithras was indeed pre-Christian; but there was nothing to prevent it from adopting Christian practices when it met them in its advance to the West). A certain support for such a view might be based on the *Didache*, which provides an eucharistic formula which contains no reference to the Last Supper and may be a very early document of Palestinian origin.

Now whatever the exact meaning of S. Paul's statement that he "received from the Lord" his account of the Last Supper may be, it is perfectly safe to reject any theory which holds that the introduction of a ritual meal, described as a partaking of the Body and Blood of the Lord, is simply due to him. The two Corinthian letters presuppose that he has been vigorously attacked at Corinth by Jewish Christian teachers, whose opposition to himself is largely due to the fact that a certain section of the converts have in fact come to regard Christianity as a "mystery-religion" of a rather low type. Their errors are due to a not altogether unnatural misinterpretation

of S. Paul's own teaching (cf. c. VII. § iii.). S. Paul's whole conduct has been submitted to very severe criticism. Yet there is no suggestion that his teaching on the Eucharist has been attacked, or that his Jewish opponents saw in it any serious innovation on the teaching with which they were familiar. Now it is comparatively easy to introduce new doctrines into a religious movement. Only trained theologians are able to appreciate their novelty, or to appreciate their probable effect on the whole character of the religion. Except where particular doctrines have become catchwords of opposing parties in a controversy and are referred to in the technical terms of controversy, the average hearer will not appreciate the fact that any change or innovation is involved. On the other hand the moment that any sacramental practice is employed to express such doctrines, the innovation impresses itself immediately on the worshipper. Now it would have been easy for S. Paul to introduce a wholly new sacramental system into the Gentile communities which he founded, at the moment of his first arrival, since his hearers had no means of telling, apart from his teaching, what Christianity was, and would have no *a priori* objection to the adoption of heathen practices. But it would have been entirely impossible for him to make innovations of this kind without exciting the notice of the Jewish Christians who visited the city, and without involving himself in a violent controversy with them on the subject. Of such a controversy, however, there is no trace. The difficulty over the Eucharist at Corinth is certainly not due to Jewish Christians; it probably originates with those Christians who are already inclined to debase Christianity into a mystery-cult in which "speaking with tongues" is the one test of religion (c. VII. § iii. nn. 14, 15). Of controversy with Jewish opponents over the introduction of a new rite there is not a hint. There is a violent controversy with these opponents, but it does not concern the Eucharist. The only possible explanation is that they did not see in the Eucharist anything which struck them as unfamiliar.

There are, however, certain other objections to the theory that the Eucharist as we find it in 1 Cor. has been seriously affected by the practice of Gentile "mystery-religions." The first of these is the violent opposition which existed between Judaism and these cults—a mutual hostility which was inherited by the Church. For this cf. c. VI. § v. n. 16, and for Jewish opinions as to the mystery-cults see Wisd. xiv. 23 and c. IV. § i. n. 35. (How far the reference is to the older civic mysteries, and how far to the later oriental cults, does not here concern us. All Gentile mystery-cults are condemned as such; whether the writers knew of any particular class of cults of this type does not alter the fact that Jews and Christians alike were bound to condemn them. The Egyptian mysteries must have been well known to Philo in so far as the fact of their existence was concerned.)

Further it is clear that in general the rites and doctrines of these cults were a very well-kept secret. Of the Christian apologists, Justin Martyr does know something of Mithraism (*Apol.* i. 66, *Dial.* 70, 78), but in this respect he stands alone. Nothing is so remarkable as the preoccupation of these writers with the public cults and mythologies of the classical period, and their ignorance of the oriental mysteries. Thus Minucius Felix (*Octavius* xx.) is aware of the existence of the mysteries of Isis, which he could hardly fail to know by reputation in view of their popularity at Rome, but he knows nothing about them apart from the public and popular mythology from which they were derived; of their esoteric significance he betrays no knowledge. Similarly Theophilus (*ad Autol.* i. 75) knows the mythology of Osiris, Attis and Adonis; but he seems to know nothing of the significance of their cults, though he mentions the Osiris-mysteries. Athenagoras knows only the stories of Herodotus as to the Egyptian mysteries; it is to be supposed that in all these cases the writers knew at least of the existence of the cults; but they could only criticize them on the basis of the popular mythology. This criticism would hardly be effective as against the initiated; it is to be presumed that the absence of more serious attacks on the esoteric teaching is due to the lack of information on the subject. Ignatius (*ad Eph.* 12, 17, 19) uses language which betrays a familiarity with the terminology of such religions, sufficient to suggest that he may in fact have been fairly closely acquainted with at least one of them; but in this respect he and Justin stand alone. While S. Paul and many other writers are familiar with the general theological language in which these religions expressed themselves, they show no knowledge of their institutions or the inner meaning of their mythologies. The reason would seem to be that the secrets were too closely kept; and the fact is remarkable when it is remembered that there might easily be Christians who had been initiated (possibly it was considered unsafe even for the convert to reveal them). In any case the facts are sufficient to exclude any reasonable probability of a borrowing by S. Paul from the institutions of Mithraism or any other of these cults in which "sacramental" meals may have occurred.

Before proceeding to consider the exact implications of the variants in the N.T. versions of the Last Supper, it is convenient to examine the *Didache*. Here we have several peculiarities. The rite is apparently to be used by the president, when there is no prophet present who can provide a more spiritual form of celebration. It opens with a blessing of the Bread and Cup in forms which show a marked affinity with the blessings used at Jewish meals, especially at the Paschal meal. There follows a direction that none are to eat or to drink of "the Eucharist" but the baptized. After all are satisfied (μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι) the following eucharistic prayers are to be said (οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε).

εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ παιδός σου· πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ σύ· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. There follows a prayer for the preservation of the Church and its gathering together from the four winds into the kingdom prepared for it. The formula concludes ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. ὡσαννὰ τῷ Θεῷ Δαυείδ. εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοείτω. μαρὰν ἀθά· ἀμήν.

Now whatever else this may be, it is not a primitive liturgy in which certain "spiritual" conceptions are found, which have been "materialized" by the later practice of the Church, as introduced by S. Paul, into a ritual meal in which those present become partakers of the Body and Blood of the Lord. The prayers quoted above show that precisely the opposite has happened. The conceptions of knowledge, faith, and immortality, spiritual food and drink, and eternal life, are precisely the conceptions which were common to Christianity and Hellenistic theology (cf. c. IV. § i. App. II). In part those conceptions were due to the influence of Hellenistic theology on Christianity or pre-Christian Judaism. In fact the same thing has occurred here that happened in the mystery-cults. The original and more "material" element has been given a "spiritual" significance, in order to explain its underlying mystical meaning. (The fact that in this case the "more material element" is the Last Supper, while in the mystery-cults it is a mythology often of the crudest and most primitive kind, is immaterial so far as the historical development is concerned.) The development is similar to that which we meet in the eucharistic discourse of Jno. vi. (for its prevalence in mystery-religions cf. Reitzenstein, *Die Hell. Myst.-Rel.* 24); the supposition that S. Paul could transform such teaching into a ritual meal under the hostile supervision of Jewish opponents familiar with the more "spiritual" teaching of the *Didache* is too idle to need comment. If the *Didache* really intends to omit all reference to the Last Supper, it must emanate from circles which are trying to "spiritualize" the Eucharist in the interest of Hellenistic religious conceptions.

Further examination of this "liturgy" reveals other interesting features. The opening blessings of the Cup and the Bread show, as has been noted, affinity with the Jewish blessings before meals. At the end of them comes a meal. After this meal we get further prayers over the Bread and Cup, now in this order. But at the end of these comes an invitation, "He that is holy, let him come." The last invitation, when taken in conjunction with the fact that the two groups of blessings are in the reverse order,

suggests that the liturgy provided is not simply the Eucharist, *i.e.* the ritual eating of bread and wine which at Corinth follows on the common meal. The ritual meal by itself could not naturally be described as ἐμπλησθῆναι, nor is it possible to find any explanation of the second invitation if the Eucharist is already over. On the other hand the liturgy is easy to understand if the formula is intended not merely for the Eucharist but for a combination of the Eucharist with a common meal. The opening blessings are the Jewish beginnings of a meal, modified by the circumstances in which they are being employed. After the meal proper follows the Eucharist; and in the latter, at the end of the eucharistic prayers, the invitation to communion, *i.e.* the ritual eating and drinking with which the meal concludes and the eucharistic "Amen" (cf. Justin Martyr, *loc. cit.*). Of the reversal of the order of the prayers over the Bread and the Cup there is one simple and obvious explanation. The writer and his readers assume that the latter part of the rite is a commemoration of the Last Supper. The actual words of the narrative of the institution are not given, either because the association is presumed, and does not need to be stated, or far more probably because it was not customary to write down the crucial liturgical formula in a document which might fall into the hands of unbelievers. The same phenomenon is to be found in S. Paul and Justin Martyr. Both record the Last Supper in connection with the Eucharist; neither leaves any room for doubt that he expects the actual institution of the Eucharist to be recorded as part of the Liturgy; but neither states it in so many words. Thus the heathen would know that the Eucharist was a commemoration of the Last Supper; they would not know the formula in which the connection was recorded, and by which the Eucharist was made a genuine one. I cannot feel any doubt that this has occurred in the *Didache*. The question of the date of this work is, if the foregoing account be correct, irrelevant. It may be very ancient; but in any case it is the result of an attempt to find an underlying spiritual meaning for the existing rite, not a spiritual beginning which has been materialized later. (With the question of how far the author was justified in his attempt, or how far his spiritual interpretation is correct, we are not here concerned.)

Although, however, it is impossible to regard the eucharistic formula of the *Didache* as containing a survival of a primitive Palestinian use, in which there was no specific allusion to the Last Supper, the fact that the first part of the rite, which has been identified above with the common meal of the Church preceding the Eucharist proper, begins with a blessing of wine, is of importance. It indicates the survival at these meals of formulae modelled on the blessings usually employed at Jewish meals and, in particular, at the Paschal meal; for these cf. *Life and Times*, I. 496. In these meals it was usual to begin with a blessing of the wine which was to

be drunk at the meal. It is to this practice that we must look for the peculiar account of the institution of the Eucharist in Lk. xxii. 17. In this passage, as is well known, we have an account differing both from that of S. Paul and that of S. Mark. At the beginning of the meal Our Lord takes the Cup and says λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. Then follows the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist in practically the same terms as those of 1 Cor. xi. 23. (The omission of *v.* 20 in some MSS. is obviously an error, due to the idea of a copyist that *v.* 17 quoted above is the institution of the chalice, and that the institution proper in *v.* 20 is unnecessary. It is easy to understand such an omission; it is not easy to understand how S. Luke should come to give an account wholly different from S. Paul's, nor how a copyist, having already apparently one account of the institution, should come to insert another.) Thus S. Luke differs from S. Paul in that he inserts a blessing of the Cup, and the statement λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ πίω κ.τ.λ., at the beginning of the Last Supper. On the other hand he differs from S. Mark in that this statement is in Mk xiv. 25 appended to the institution of the Cup, the Marcan formula for which is τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. In other words, S. Luke has taken the clauses appended by S. Mark to the institution of the Cup and attached them to a blessing and distribution of the Cup at the beginning of the Last Supper, following them up with the Pauline narrative of the institution.

Now this proceeding admits of one simple explanation. S. Luke has been present at the common meal and Eucharist of the Church in Jerusalem. Here he has noticed the fact that the meal begins with a blessing of the chalice; and he has also noticed that the actual words used at the consecration of the chalice proper differ from those used in the Pauline communities. In his narrative he has retained the Pauline version of the actual institution of the Eucharist; but in order to retain the latter part of the Marcan formula, which he has heard in Palestine, he has inserted it into the blessing of the Cup which he has witnessed at the opening of the common meal in Jerusalem. His method of proceeding has been rendered easier by the fact that the Marcan formula is reminiscent of the blessing of the Cup at the beginning of a meal as used no doubt by Our Lord Himself at the Last Supper, which ran "Blessed art thou, Jehovah our God, who hast given us the fruit of the vine" (*Life and Times, loc. cit.*).

It has been seen above that the supposition that S. Paul introduced the Eucharist from non-Christian sources need not be discussed seriously. Nor is it credible that having heard of the Last Supper as an incident in

the story of the Passion, he should have introduced the practice of a regular commemoration of it at the weekly common meal of the Church. So far as the texts are concerned, the fact that neither S. Mark nor S. Matthew record any command of Our Lord to continue its celebration would indeed be compatible with such a view; the historical situation is not. S. Paul's opponents would immediately have seen in such an innovation an attempt to found a ritual system to replace the Law which he had abolished, and they could not have failed to protest against it. That the direct words commanding the repetition of the rite as recorded in Lk. and 1 Cor. are a Pauline addition is indeed possible; but, that the regular use of the narrative of the Last Supper at the eucharistic termination of the common meal as an explanation of the origin of the rite is a Pauline addition, is not credible. In this matter he could develop what he found, so long as his developments did not appear to his opponents to be innovations on the existing practice of the Church, but he could not introduce so sweeping a novelty as this without incurring opposition from the Hebrew Christians at Corinth, and of such opposition in regard to the Eucharist there is not a trace in 1 Cor. The only explanation of the absence of such opposition is that the association of the Eucharist as the conclusion of the common meal with the Last Supper was part of the practice of Hebrew Christianity before S. Paul started his career as the Apostle of the Gentiles.

The practice however, if it originated within Hebrew Christianity, can hardly have been due to anything but Our Lord's command. It has been seen that there is some possibility that the actual command to repeat the rite, as recorded by S. Luke and S. Paul, may be a Pauline addition; but this does not mean that the actual practice of continuing the rite among the Hebrew Christians was not due to Our Lord Himself. In themselves the words "my Blood of the covenant" implied that the rite was to be repeated; they refer to the sprinkling of the blood of the Paschal lamb, and therefore would suggest that the new rite was to be repeated, as the Paschal rites had been. By themselves however they need not imply more than an annual repetition; but the rite is apparently a feature of the daily life of the first Christians in Jerusalem. Now in tracing the origin of this rite it is necessary to point out that the fact that the words commanding any regular use of the rite are only to be found in S. Paul and S. Luke is quite inconclusive as evidence that the disciples received no such command, or that in continuing its use they were acting in a manner which Our Lord had not intended. It is necessary to remember that the words of institution had, by the time the earliest of our Gospels was composed, been in use for some twenty years or more (*i.e.* from a time anterior to S. Paul's conversion) as part of a liturgical formula. That formula however seems to have been combined with improvised prayers and prophesyings, including

in some cases "speaking with tongues." Now even when used without such additions liturgical formularies are liable to a certain degree of variation, though always within certain limits. In all liturgies there is the same tendency to variety of detail combined with fixity of general type, unless there is a strongly centralized ecclesiastical authority to prevent the development of varieties. Where the fixed element is practically limited, as it is in the present case, to a few phrases, while the rest of the worship is largely, if not entirely, improvised, the chances of variation are obviously increased. Hence it is not surprising that, by the time the four narratives which we possess were compiled, there should be considerable variation; for we are not dealing merely with a narrative of the events of the Last Supper (as we are in dealing with the rest of Our Lord's life), but with a narrative which has developed into a liturgical formula. Whether the command to continue the narrative of the Last Supper as a religious rite was given by Our Lord at the moment in the words recorded by S. Paul, or whether it was due to a command expressed at the time or implied by the circumstances, is obviously a matter of secondary importance. The evidence certainly does not admit of any attempt to ascribe the introduction of the rite to anyone but Our Lord Himself; and it is not surprising that after a generation or more of unregulated liturgical use, the exact words of Our Lord, on which the practice of its continuance rested, should have been lost. It may be added that for these reasons it is impossible to say with certainty that the command to continue the rite of the Last Supper recorded in Lk. and 1 Cor. is not genuine. It must be remembered that 1 Cor. is probably the oldest narrative of the incident; and while it would be more natural to regard the fuller version as the result of later additions to the original, it is not possible to be certain in a case such as the present, where the historical narratives presuppose liturgical practice. The omission of the actual command in Mk may be due to the fact that in the eucharistic form to which the writer is accustomed the command to continue the rite has been omitted, just as the version in Mt. inserts *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, an explanatory note which has crept into the rite known to the author of the Gospel.

If, however, the actual command to continue the rite was not given by Our Lord at the actual moment of the Last Supper, it is possible that we can find evidence of a tradition of a command to do so given (or alleged to have been given) by Him on another occasion. In Lk. xxiv. 30 we are told of an appearance by Our Lord to two disciples, at which He takes bread, blesses it, breaks it and gives it to them. The language certainly suggests that the meal has in S. Luke's eyes some eucharistic associations. Now it has been noted in the Appendix on the Apostolate that the narrative of an appearance by Our Lord to the Twelve and others with them which

follows in *v.* 33 is intended by S. Luke to be an account of the appearance of Our Lord to "all the Apostles" referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 7. Of an appearance to two disciples S. Paul makes no mention, but his silence is natural, since the two were not prominent Christians, and the appearance would have little value as a means of persuading Gentiles to accept the truth of the story of the Resurrection. For S. Paul's purpose only appearances to well-known and easily identified Christians or to fairly large groups of Christians are of any value. So it is possible that S. Luke here is recording a non-Pauline tradition according to which the continuance of the Eucharist was due to a command given by Our Lord after His Resurrection. Since however S. Luke has followed the Pauline narrative of the Last Supper, he cannot insert a command to continue the observance of the Eucharist at this point, and consequently preserves only the rather unintelligible eucharistic language of xxiv. 30, without the command to preserve the rite of the Last Supper, which would have made it intelligible. In this case it would appear that the tradition of Jerusalem was that the institution of the Eucharist occurred at the Last Supper, but that the command to continue its observance was given by Our Lord after His Resurrection; this would account both for the absence of any command to continue the rite in the Marcan narrative of the Last Supper, and also the continuance of the rite by the Christians of Jerusalem, which is presupposed by the absence of opposition to it among the Pauline communities. It is however obvious that we are here in the realm of conjecture; and it is far more natural to suppose that the command to continue the Last Supper as a rite was either given by Our Lord explicitly or implied in the circumstances of its institution. In any case it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the Pauline account of the Eucharist presupposes its existence as a ritual meal originating in the Last Supper, among the Hebrew Christians, and that the existence of the practice among the Hebrew Christians can only be due to the expressed or implied command of Our Lord that the regular commemoration of the Last Supper with the use of the words of institution was to be part of the life of His followers. It has indeed been noted that there is some evidence that the actual narrative of the Last Supper was in some cases replaced by "spiritual utterances"; but the evidence is not conclusive, since it is possible that the actual narrative was in all cases added to any spiritual utterances that might precede the Eucharist proper. In any case however it seems that the words of institution would only be omitted when it was believed that they had been rendered unnecessary by a direct intervention of the Holy Spirit.

With regard to the extent to which S. Paul's eucharistic doctrine represents a development of the earlier beliefs of the Church we have no

evidence. It is indeed possible that the Hebrew community, with its strong sense of brotherhood and its expectation of an imminent return of the Lord, regarded the Eucharist primarily as a meal which expressed the unity of the faithful with their Master and with one another pending His coming, and that the Pauline conception of it as primarily a partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ is a later development of the implications of the words of Our Lord at the Last Supper. But the development is rather a difference of emphasis than a change of content, and here we are dealing with conjectures for which evidence is entirely lacking. The Pauline conception is certainly calculated to meet the demand of Hellenistic religion for a means by which man may obtain salvation from this life by union with God, and for a sacramental form by which this union may be achieved; but such a demand for salvation would also be felt by the Hebrew who looked for a spiritual fulfilment of the Messianic promises. On the other hand the Gentile convert would naturally attach more importance to the Eucharist, since it was the outstanding feature of his religious life, than the Jew, for whom it was an addition to the older form of worship which he continued to observe.

(*Note*. If the account of S. Paul's service at Troas given above be correct, it is possible that it represents a deliberate change as against the practice established by S. Paul at Corinth. It would be natural for him to make changes in order to obviate the danger of disorders similar to those he combats in 1 Cor. Thus we have, at Corinth, the common meal followed by the Eucharist, the latter being accompanied by prophesyings etc. At Troas we have apparently a long discourse by S. Paul, taking the place of prophesyings by members of the community, followed by the Eucharist and the common meal. The view that we have here a deliberate change from earlier practice is to some extent supported by the account of Pliny, *Ad Traj*. 97, where the Christians meet by night to sing hymns and to bind themselves by an oath (*sacramentum*) to commit no crimes. They then separate, and meet together by day for a common meal. Pliny's account is obscured by his use of the word *sacramentum*; it is hard to see what he means by his reference to the oath of the Christians, and it is likely that he misunderstands the use of the word as employed in evidence before him. If so, the night service he describes is one of singing, probably the recitation of Psalms and canticles, *i.e.* the synagogue service, substituted for the now obsolete prophesyings of an earlier period, and terminating in the Eucharist; the meeting by day is the common meal which is becoming more exclusively a social function.)

INDEX

(1) AUTHORS

(*a*) *Old Testament*

Genesis, 55 nn. 25 and 28; 71 n. 4; 117 n. 25; 131; 228 n. 5; 371
Exodus, 105 n. 1; 131; 132; 178 n. 33
Leviticus, 132; 230 n. 19; 291 n. 4; 375
Numbers, 114 n. 14; 283 n. 49; 371
Deuteronomy, 24 n. 52; 56 n. 41; 82 n. 2; 110 n. 9; 113 n. 13; 116 n. 22; 117 n. 25; 144; 206 n. 1; 353 n. 17; 371
Joshua, 55 n. 28
1 Samuel, 33; 132
1 Kings, 56 n. 41; 105 n. 1
2 Kings, 70 n. 4
Ezra, 70 n. 4; 197 n. 8
Nehemiah, 70 n. 4; 172 n. 5; 197 n. 8
Esther, 197 n. 8
Psalms, 18 n. 25; 110 n. 9; 113 n. 13; 144; 290 n. 4
Proverbs, 110 n. 9; 127; 132
Isaiah, 16 n. 23; 18 n. 25; 30; 82 n. 2; 110 n. 9; 128; 131; 132; 138; 353 n. 17
Jeremiah, 18 n. 25; 25 n. 56; 34
Ezekiel, 25 n. 56
Daniel, 17 n. 24; 110 n. 9; 113 n. 12; 354 n. 22
Joel, 17 n. 24
Habakkuk, 120 n. 36; 230 n. 19
Zechariah, 28 n. 62; 108 n. 9
Malachi, 92 n. 35; 109 n. 9; 339 n. 15

(*b*) *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T., etc.*

Adam and Eve, Books of, 114 n. 14; 116 n. 20
Aristeas, Letter of, 25 n. 53; 126; 127; 178
Assumptio Moysis, 17 n. 24; 24 nn. 51 and 52; 28 n. 62
Biblical Antiquities, 17 n. 24; 35; 71 n. 4; 114 n. 14
2 Baruch, 17 n. 24; 24 n. 51; 50 n. 10; 56 n. 37; 110 n. 9; 111 n. 12; 118 n. 25; 129; 142
3 Baruch, 112 n. 12; 114 n. 14
Ecclesiasticus, 71 n. 4; 91 n. 35
1 Enoch, 17 n. 24; 24 nn. 51 and 52; 25 n. 56; 30; 31; 36; 50 n. 10; 56 n. 37; 110 n. 9; 111 n. 12; 116 n. 20; 118 n. 25; 140; 142; 178 n. 33
2 Enoch, 111 n. 12; 114 n. 14; 116 n. 20
4 Esdras, 17 n. 24; 24 nn. 51 and 52; 28 n. 62; 31; 56 n. 37; 93 n. 37; 108 n. 9; 115 n. 14; 117 n. 25; 119 n. 30; 129; 230 n. 19; 231 n. 29; 326 n. 30; 353 n. 17
Jubilees, Book of, 23 n. 49; 24 n. 51; 55 n. 28; 71 n. 4; 112 n. 12; 113 n. 13; 115 n. 14; 116 n. 20; 208 n. 9
Judith, 31; 197 n. 8
Lost Apocrypha, 110 n. 9
1 Maccabees, 71 n. 4; 88 n. 20; 197 n. 8
2 Maccabees, 16 n. 21; 83 n. 3; 93 n. 37; 154 n. 6; 197 n. 8; 373
3 Maccabees, 23 n. 50
4 Maccabees, 22 n. 46; 25 n. 55; 111 n. 12; 118 n. 25; 142
Martyrium Isaiae, 71 n. 4
Pirke 'Aboth, 12 n. 7; 22 n. 46; 26 n. 57; 92 n. 35; 93 n. 37; 106 n. 5
Psalms of Solomon, 23 n. 49; 24 n. 51; 60 n. 48; 90 n. 35
Sibylline Oracles, 26 n. 57; 27 n. 58; 56 n. 37; 228 n. 5; 231 n. 26; 276 n. 22
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 12 n. 6; (in Our Lord's teaching) *ib.* n. 7 and 17 n. 24; 23 n. 49; 24 n. 52; 25 n. 56; 26 n. 57; (on Samaritans) 55 n. 28 and 71 n. 4; (in the Epistle of James) 91 n. 35; 93 n. 37; (in S. Paul) 107 n. 9; 112 n. 12 and 113 n. 13
Tobit, 23 n. 50; 56 n. 37; 154 n. 10
Wisdom, 23 n. 49; 25 n. 55; 26 n. 57; 82 n. 2; 111 n. 12; 114 n. 13; 126 *seqq.*; 137; 138; 143; 228 n. 5; 234 n. 41; 353 n. 17; 377

(*c*) *New Testament*

Matthew, S., Gospel of, xv; xxvii; 12 n. 7; 14 nn. 16 *seqq.*; 16 n. 23; 17 n. 24; 18 n. 25; 21 nn. 41, 42 and 45; 25 n. 56; 72 n. 8; 73 n. 12; 84 n. 7; 85 n. 10; 88 n. 21; 89 n. 27; 172 n. 4; 175 n. 18; 178 n. 33; 208 n. 9; 210 n. 17; 363; 371; 383
Mark, S., Gospel of, xv; xxvii; 12 n. 3; 14 nn. 15 *seqq.*; 17 n. 24; 20 n. 41; 22 nn. 46 and 47; 29 n. 68; 30; 56 nn. 37 and 40; 58 n. 44; 72 n. 8; 75 n. 16; 84 n. 7; 88 n. 21; 89 n. 29; 90 n. 34; 172 n. 4; 175 n. 18; 178 n. 33; 370; 381
Luke, S., Gospel of, viii; xv; xxvii; 13 n. 7; 14 n. 16; 17 n. 24; 31; 56 n. 41; 71 n. 4; 72 nn. 7 and 8; 74 n. 12; 84 n. 7; 88 n. 21; 90 n. 35; 93 n. 37; 105 n. 2; 116 n. 20; 154 n. 6; 177 n. 33; 366; 370; 381 *seqq.*
John, S., Gospel of, 14 n. 18; 16 n. 23; 20 n. 41; 22 n. 46; 25 n. 56; 33; 52 n. 12; 55 n. 33; 58 nn. 44 and 45; 64; 65; 71 n. 5; 74 n. 12; 75 n. 18; 84 n. 7; 87 n. 18; 271 n. 7; 304 n. 16; 307; 379
Acts (authorship), ix *seqq.* *See* references *passim*
Romans, ix; 23 nn. 49 and 50; 26 n. 57; 27 n. 59; 28 nn. 62 and 64; 108 n. 9; 113 n. 13; 115 n. 19; 117 nn. 23 *seqq.*; 126 *seqq.*; 142 *seqq.*; 190 n. 20; 228 n. 5; 235 n. 41; 257 n. 11; 258 nn. 17 and 19; 259 n. 21; 260 nn. 24 *seqq.*; 280 n. 41; 282 n. 44; 292 n. 10; 293 nn. 14, 15 and 16; 294 nn. 20 and 22; 295 n. 27; 306 n. 21; 318 n. 3; 324 n. 25;

326 n. 30; 335 n. 1; 339 nn. 14 and 15; 340 n. 17; 342 n. 28; 347 *seqq.* and notes; 364
1 Corinthians, 21 n. 44; 23 n. 49; 33 *seqq.*; 107 n. 9; 111 n. 12 *seqq.*; 128 *seqq.*; 139 *seqq.*; 217; 234 n. 41; 280 n. 41; 290 n. 4; 291 n. 6; 292 nn. 10 *seqq.*; 316 *seqq.*; 318 nn. 3 *seqq.*; 354 n. 24; 365 *seqq.*; 372 *seqq.*
2 Corinthians, ix; 53 n. 20; 59 n. 47; 108 n. 9; 112 n. 12; 114 n. 14; 116 n. 20; 119 n. 33; 120 nn. 37 *seqq.*; 128 *seqq.*; 141 *seqq.*; 248 n. 12; 272 n. 11; 277 n. 31; 282 n. 44; 292 n. 10; 293 nn. 14 *seqq.*; 320 n. 10; 324 n. 25; 330; 334; 335 nn. 1 *seqq.*; 364 *seqq.*
Galatians, 21 n. 44; 23 n. 49; 88 n. 20; 107 n. 9; 114 n. 13; 116 nn. 22 *seqq.*; 132; 145; 176 n. 29; 185 n. 3; 188 nn. 14 *seqq.*; 196 nn. 1 *seqq.*; 215 n. 38; 220 *seqq.*; 227 nn. 5 *seqq.*; 291 n. 6; 292 nn. 10 *seqq.*; 295 n. 27; 307; 318 n. 5; 327 n. 35; 356 n. 24; 364 *seqq.*
Ephesians, xi; 21 n. 44; 23 n. 49; 27 n. 61; 108 n. 9; 111 n. 12; 119 nn. 33 *seqq.*; 128; 132; 290 n. 4; 355 n. 24
Colossians, 21 n. 44; 23 n. 49; 27 n. 61; 108 n. 9; 111 n. 12; 114 n. 13; 116 nn. 20 *seqq.*; 119 n. 33; 134; 209 n. 11; 248 n. 13; 291 n. 6; 293 n. 15; 304 n. 16; 306 n. 22
Philippians, 48 n. 3; 105 n. 3; 108 n. 8; 116 n. 20; 118 n. 27; 119 n. 33; 120 nn. 36 *seqq.*; 132; 134; 249 n. 16; 250 n. 21; 257 n. 13; 270 n. 5; 274 n. 13; 277 n. 32; 294 n. 19; 335 n. 30; 355 n. 24
1 Thessalonians, ix; 21 n. 44; 34; 37; 38; 90 n. 32; 107 n. 9; 112 n. 12; 118 n. 27; 120 nn. 35 and 37; 121 n. 40; 145; 187 n. 9; 215 n. 38; 228 n. 5; 229 n. 6; 236 n. 42; 270 n. 4; 271 nn. 5 and 7; 272 nn. 11 *seqq.*; 281 n. 42; 282 n. 43; 291 nn. 5 and 6; 292 n. 10; 325 n. 30
2 Thessalonians, ix; 84 n. 7; 120 n. 37; 145; 187 n. 9; 190 n. 20; 271 n. 7; 281 n. 42; 292 n. 10
1 Timothy, 74 n. 12; 110 n. 9; 112 n. 12; 114 n. 14; 271 n. 7; 293 n. 15
2 Timothy, 24 n. 50; 28 n. 62; 325 n. 30; 354 n. 24
Titus, 115 n. 16; 147; 354 n. 20
Philemon, 121 n. 42
Hebrews, 16 n. 23; 21 n. 44; 28 n. 62; 86 n. 17; 88 n. 23; 118 n. 25; 292 n. 10; 374
James, xi; 14 n. 14; 16 n. 23; 21 n. 44; 22 n. 46; 27 n. 60; 28 n. 62; 31; 84 n. 7; 86 n. 17; 89 n. 24; 91 n. 35; 118 n. 25; 292 n. 10; 293 n. 13; 320 n. 9; 338 n. 8
1 Peter, 16 n. 23; 17 n. 24; 21 n. 44; 23 n. 49; 28 n. 62; 111 n. 12; 216 n 38; 260 n. 25; 271 n. 7; 292 n. 10; 293 n. 14; 296 n. 30; 323 n. 13; 354 n. 20
1 John, 16 n. 23; 28 n. 62; 33
Jude, 36
Revelation, 16 n. 23; 17 n. 24; 23 n. 49; 28 n. 62; 50 n. 10; 116 n. 20; 293 n. 17

(*d*) *Later Christian and Jewish writers*

'*Aboda Zara*, 23 nn. 49 and 50; 83 n. 3; 154 n. 10; 326 n. 31
Apollonius, 174 n. 15
Athenagoras, 378
Barnabas, Epistle of, 23 n. 49; 29 n. 67; 54 n. 24; 88 n. 23
Berakhoth, Tractate, 22 n. 46; 72 n. 7
Clement of Alexandria, 49 n. 6; 110 n. 9; 164 n. 16; 174 n. 15; 293 n. 17
Clement of Rome, 280 n. 41; 339 n. 15
Cyprian, 234 n. 41
Didache, 23 n. 49; 35; 86 n. 17; 89 nn. 23 and 25; 141; 216 n. 38; 370; 373 *seqq.*
Epiphanius, 75 n. 18; 87 n. 17
Eusebius, 35; 49 n. 6; 89 n. 25; 92 n. 36; 174 n. 15; 190 n. 20; 207 n. 6; 208 n. 9; 216 n. 38; 248 n. 13; 370
Hegesippus, 89 n. 25; 92 n. 36
Ignatius, 232 n. 32; 374; 378
Irenaeus, 17 n. 24; 234 n. 41
Josephus, 23 n. 50; 25 n. 53; 58 nn. 43 and 44; 61 *seqq.*; 71 n. 4; 82 n. 3; 153 n. 6; 160 n. 3; 161 n. 5; 172 n. 2; 173 nn. 11 and 15; 177 n. 33; 186 nn. 6 *seqq.*; 256 nn. 7 *seqq.*; 271 n. 7; 276 n. 27; 277 nn. 28 and 34; 283 n. 49; 302 nn. 5 *seqq.*; 320 n. 9; 360 n. 2
— on the sects of Judaism, 18 n. 25; 19 n. 28; 36; 48 n. 1; 50 n. 8; 375
— on the revolutionary movement in Judaea, 13 n. 10; 22 n. 45; 52 nn. 15 *seqq.*; 59 n. 45; 154 n. 6; 173 n. 12; 176 n. 27; 177 n. 33; 339 n. 16; 360 n. 2; 361 nn. 5 *seqq.*; 362 n. 15
— statistics of, 15 n. 21; 361 n. 5
— supposed references to Christianity, 15 nn. 18 and 20; 92 n. 36
Justin Martyr, 24 n. 50; 73 n. 8; 117 n. 22; 175 n. 18; 275 n. 15; 276 n. 27; 339 n. 15; 373; 376
Midrash Rabba, 114 n. 14
Minucius Felix, 378
Onkelos, Targum of, 114 n. 14
Origen, 92 n. 36; 190 n. 20; 208 n. 8
Orosius, 207 n. 6; 257 n. 16
Philo, 14 n. 16; 23 nn. 49 and 50; 24 n. 52; 26 n. 57; 28 nn. 62 and 63; 55 nn. 27, 29 and 33; 71 n. 4; 117 n. 25; 162 n. 8; 172 n. 2; 173 n. 11; 186 n. 8; 211 n. 25; 216 n. 38; 256 n. 3 and 6; 259 n. 21; 303 nn. 9 and 11; 361 n. 2; 375
— and S. Paul, 111 n. 12; 113 n. 13; 115 n. 16; 116 n. 20; 118 n. 25; 120 n. 35; 126 *seqq.*; 138; 142; 144; 228 n. 5; 290 n. 4; 304 n. 17; 327 n. 37
— on Judaism, 25 n. 54; 56 n. 37; 82 n. 2; 123 n. 55; 290 n. 4; 303 n. 11; 320 n. 9; 375

Philo on the Essenes, 19 n. 28; 48 n. 1; 93 n. 37
Sanhedrin, Tractate, 13 n. 8; 56 nn. 40 and 41; 92 n. 35; 116 n. 22; 175 n. 18
Tertullian, 111 n. 12; 211 n. 25; 234 n. 41; 270 n. 4; 323 n. 13; 328 n. 37
Theophilus, *ad Autolycum*, 275 n. 19; 378

(e) *Heathen writers*

Apuleius, 143; 276 n. 27
Cicero, 256 n. 2; 257 n. 12; 302 n. 8; 304 n. 15
Corpus Hermeticum, 143 *seqq.*
Dio Cassius, 207 n. 6; 208 n. 9; 259 n. 23
Hecataeus, 275 n. 19
Juvenal, 25 n. 53; 27 n. 58; 154 n. 10; 162 n. 9; 251 n. 25; 257 nn. 12 and 13; 270 n. 4; 354 n. 22
Livy, 211 n. 25
Lucian, 89 n. 27; 120 n. 35; 208 n. 9; 275 n. 16; 276 n. 27
Pausanias, 276 nn. 22 and 27; 302 n. 3
Philostratus, *see* Apollonius of Tyana in General Index
Plato, 128
Pliny, the elder, 207 n. 4; 208 n. 9; 257 n. 12; 341 n. 25
— the younger, 211 n. 25; 248 n. 10; 306 n. 23; 385
Plutarch, 251 n. 25
Propertius, 162 n. 9
Tacitus, *Annals*, 52 n. 16; 53 n. 17; 185 n. 3; 186 n. 8; 211 n. 25; 248 n. 10; 256 n. 9; 257 nn. 12 and 13; 260 n. 23; 275 n. 15; 303 n. 10; 341 n. 26; 355 n. 24; 360 nn. 1 and 2
— *Histories*, 25 n. 53; 154 n. 10; 161 n. 5; 186 n. 8; 257 n. 12; 341 n. 25; 361 n. 3
Strabo, 124 n. 66; 275 n. 19; 276 n. 27; 302 nn. 3 and 8
Suetonius, 52 n. 16; 208 n. 9; 211 n. 25; 251 n. 25; 256 nn. 5 and 9; 257 nn. 12 and 16; 259 nn. 21 and 23; 260 n. 23; 279 n. 37
Valerius Maximus, 251 n. 24

(2) GENERAL

Abraham, 117 n. 25; 131; 230 n. 19; 347
Achaea, 267; 282 n. 44
Adam, 116 nn. 20 and 21; 134; 139; 348; 352 n. 13
Adonis, 378
Adramyttium, 302 n. 8
Africa, 211 n. 25; 234 n. 41
Agabus, 163n.15; 166; 180; 350; 357n.27
"Agrippensians," 256 n. 6; 258 n. 17
Albinus, 62; 92 n. 36; 175 n. 18
Alexander of Abonoteichos, 208 n. 9; 305 n. 20
Alexandria, 23 n. 50; 124 n. 66; 161 nn. 3 and 5; 177 n. 33; 234 n. 41; 258 n. 20; 260 n. 26; 276 n. 27; 277 n. 34; 304 n. 16
"Alexandrines" in Jerusalem, 23 n. 48
Aliturus, 23 n. 50
Amphipolis, 249 n. 16; 250 n. 17; 261; 270 n. 2
Ananel, High Priest, 62
Ananias, 19 n. 28
— of Damascus, 12 n. 2; 16 n. 23; 46
— a Jewish merchant, 27 n. 58
— son of Nebedaeus, 50 n. 8; 61 *seqq.*; 175 n. 18; 306 n. 21; 359; 362 nn. 14 and 15
Ancyra, 236
Andronicus, 260 n. 24; 355 n. 24; 364; 369
Anemurium, 185 n. 3
Angelology, Pauline and Jewish, 96; 111 n. 12; 138; 323 n. 13
Angels, as mediators of the Law, 55 n. 33; 222; 230 n. 19
Annakos, 213 n. 30
Annas, High Priest, 47; 61; 62; 168
— the younger, 65; 92 n. 36; 175 n. 18
Antioch (Nicolas of), 23 n. 48; (original evangelists of) 59 n. 45; (first preaching at) 58 n. 44; 87 n. 20; 125 n. 68; 156 *seqq.*; (mission of S. Barnabas) 158 *seqq.* and notes; (Jews at) 156; 160 nn. 14 *seqq.*; 172 n. 7; (importance of) 161 n. 5; (character of Church at) 164 n. 20; 196 n. 4; (early history of Church at) 165 *seqq.*; (collection for Jerusalem) 167 *seqq.*; (mission to Jerusalem) 180 *seqq.*; (visit of S. Peter) 191 *seqq.*; (controversy as to Gentiles) 193; (mission of SS. Paul and Barnabas) 193 *seqq.*; 205; (agitation of Hebrew Christians at) 219 *seqq.*; (mission of Judas and Silas to) 227; (independence of Jerusalem) 246 n. 5; 295 n. 27
— in Pisidia, 201; 209 n. 11; 210 nn. 16 and 24; 211 n. 25; 212 n. 28; 236; 240; 247 n. 7; 296 n. 31
Antiochus Epiphanes, 62; 71 n. 24
— of Commagene, 179; 185 n. 3; 204
Antonia, Tower of, 47
Antoninus Pius, 27 n. 48
Antonius, Julius, 303 n. 11
Antony, Mark, 206 n. 2
Apamea, 302 n. 8
Apollonia, 250 n. 17; 261; 270 n. 2
Apollonius of Tyana, 208 n. 9; 275 n. 16; 276 n. 22; 305 n. 20; 309; 341 n. 26
Apollos, 177 n. 30; 304 nn. 16 and 17; 313; 321 n. 10; 323 n. 18
Apostle, meaning of the term, (in S. Luke) 363; (in S. Paul) 364; (S. Paul's claim to the title) 313; 320 n. 10; 365; (other "Apostles") 295 n. 27; 320 n. 10; 365 *seqq.*

Apostles, The Twelve, 6; 12 n. 2; 20 n. 34; 39; 45; 78 *seqq.*; 87 n. 20; 169; 170; 174 n. 15; 176 nn. 23 and 26; 368 *seqq.*
Aqua Claudia, the, 278 n. 36
Aquila and Priscilla, 255; 257 n. 16; 259 n. 23; 260 n. 24; 264; 269; 280 n. 41; 299; 355 n. 24
Arabia, 32; 47; 53 n. 20; 60 n. 49; 94; 105 n. 1; 246 n. 5
Aramaic language, 33; 48 n. 2; 277 n. 34
Archelaus, 257 n. 9; 360 n. 2
Areopagus, 275 n. 21
Aretas, 42; 53 n. 20; 59 n. 47; 102
Aristarchus, 289; 296 n. 29; 332
Aristobulus, High Priest 37 B.C., 62
— grandson of Herod the Great, 356
— High Priest 67 B.C., 62
— son of Herod the Great, 173 n. 10
Artemis of Ephesus, 290 n. 4; 297; 302 n. 3; 303 n. 11; 331; 332; 341 n. 22
Ascalon, 83 n. 2
Asia, 242; 247 n. 7; 269; 297; 300; 301; 302 nn. 5 and 8; 355 n. 24
Asiarchs, 305 n. 20; 332; 340 n. 20
Athens, 115 n. 16; 124 n. 66; 263; 273 n. 13; 274 n. 15; 275 nn. 16 and 20
Attis, 378
Atonement, the, 3; 16 n. 23; 28 n. 62; 30; 98; 116 nn. 22 and 23; 138; 221
"Augustensians," 256 n. 6
Augustus, 199; 201; 206 n. 2; 252; 256 n. 6; 259 n. 20; 360 n. 2
Aureus, the, 302 n. 8
Azizus, King of Emesa, 357
Azotus, 76; 82 n. 3; 150

Babylonia, 138; 303 n. 9
Bacchanalia, 211 n. 25
Banus, 18 n. 25
Baptism, 3; 18 n. 25; 38; 73 n. 12; 98; 117 n. 25; 146; 151; 208 n. 10; 271 n. 5; 292 n. 10; 318 n. 3
— Johannine, 38; 304 n. 16
— for the dead, 328 n. 37
Barabbas, 13 n. 10
Barcochba, 72 n. 8
Bar-Jesus, *see* Elymas
Barnabas, S., 20 n. 37; 158; 163 nn. 11 *seqq.*; (visits Jerusalem with S. Paul) 180; 184 n. 2; 190 nn. 22 *seqq.*; (compromises at Antioch) 192 *seqq.*; (mission to Cyprus) 199; 206 n. 4; 207 n. 7; 209 n. 11; (at Council of Jerusalem) 220 *seqq.*; 232 n. 35; (relation to Galatian Epistle) 227 n. 5; (quarrels with S. Paul) 240; (position as an Apostle) 206 n. 1; 363
Βασιλεὺς as title of Emperor, 271 nn. 7 and 8
Bernice, 185 n. 3
Beroea, 262; 272 n. 11; 273 n. 13; 274 n. 14; 281 n. 42
Berytus, 173 n. 11
Bithynia, 237; 243; 247 n. 10; 296 n. 30
Blasphemy, crime of, 41; 50 n. 10; 51 n. 12; 52 n. 14; 56 nn. 40 and 41; 203
Britain, 278 n. 36
"Breaking of Bread," 4 *seqq.* *See* Common Meal *and* Eucharist
Byzantium, 237; 243; 248 n. 10

Caesar, Julius, 211 n. 25; 252; 256 n. 5; 259 n. 20; 297
Caesarea, 45; 57 n. 43; 76; 82 n. 3; 151; 153 n. 6; 207 n. 7; 289 n. 1; 362 n. 17
Caesennius Paetus, 161 n. 5
Caiaphas, 2; 42; 47; 54 n. 22; 61
Caligula, 13 n. 10; 36; 52 n. 16; 54 n. 20; 63; 120 n. 37; 161 n. 5; 165; 172 nn. 2 *seqq.*; 173 nn. 11 and 15; 251 n. 25; 361 n. 2
Cappadocia, 296 n. 30
Cenchreae, 269; 276 n. 27; 282 n. 44
Census of Quirinius, 13 n. 10; 52 n. 16
"Cephas," party of, 280 n. 41; 320 n. 10. *See also* Peter
Ceremonial purity, 151; 154 n. 10; 196 n. 2; 233 n. 37
— washing, 18 n. 25; 27 n. 58
Cestius Gallus, 52 n. 16
Chloe, 324 n. 26; 326 n. 31
"Chrestus," 257 n. 16; 259 n. 23
Christian worship, 3; 7; 12 n. 2; 16 n. 22; 20 n. 38; 34; 77; 85 nn. 10 *seqq.*; 89 n. 24; 189 n. 18; 196 n. 4; 251 n. 21; 285; 292 n. 10; 312; 322 nn. 13 *seqq.*; 342 n. 31; 372 *seqq.*
Christianity, relations with Judaism, 1; 3; 6; 16 n. 22; 35 *seqq.*; 250 n. 21; 285; 291 n. 5; 292 n. 19; 300; 306 n. 21; 358 *seqq.*; (S. Stephen's view) 40; 43; 49 n. 6; 50 n. 10; 54 nn. 23 *seqq.*; (S. Paul's) 98; 118 nn. 28 *seqq.*; 120 n. 36; 122 nn. 54 *seqq.*; 181; 192; 202; 212 n. 26; (in Galatians) 221; 230 nn. 16 *seqq.*; 284; 290 n. 4; 298; 335; 343 n. 41; (in Romans) 347 and 351 nn. 10 *seqq.*; (of S. James, the Lord's brother) 80; 90 n. 35; 226; 233 n. 40; (of S. Peter) 225; 232 n. 35; 233 n. 37
— relations with the Roman Government, 202; 211 n. 25; 251 n. 24; 261; 267; 271 n. 6; 278 n. 37; 298; 303 nn. 11 *seqq.*; 331; 340 n. 21; (at Rome) 255; 257 n. 16; 259 n. 23; 349; 353 n. 20
— relations with revolutionary movement in Judaea, 1; 13 n. 10; 14 n. 18; 15 n. 20; 175 n. 18; 306 n. 21; 331; 339 n. 16; 359; 361 n. 8
— in Samaria, 67 *seqq.*; 73 nn. 12 *seqq.*
Christians, excluded from synagogues, 84 n. 7
— Pharisee, 1; 7; 12 nn. 6 and 7; 21 n. 41; 80; 224; 232 n. 35
— social status of, 19 n. 28; 79; 88 n. 23; 89 nn. 24 and 25; 166; 172 n. 5; 249

n. 16; 251 n. 23; 279 n. 39; 288; 294 n. 26; 373; (from wealthy classes) 172 n. 7; 208 n. 9; 276 n. 21; 305 n. 20; 332; 340 n. 20
Christology, primitive, 30
"Christ-party," 311; 321 n. 10; 324 n. 25; 328; 338 nn. 9 and 10
"Church," as applied to individuals, 88 n. 20; 231 n. 32; 295 n. 27
Church, the, *see* Christianity, etc.
Cilicia, 179; 184 nn. 2 *seqq.*; 191 n. 23; 199 *seqq.*; 207 n. 4; 209 nn. 11 and 13; 212 nn. 28 and 29; 219; 227 n. 3; 235 n. 41; 236; 241; 246 n. 1; 247 n. 7; 278 n. 36; 324 n. 22; 342 n. 32; 368
Circumcision, 26 n. 58; 43; 55 n. 26; 84 n. 4; 122 n. 51; 150 *seqq.* and notes; 157 and notes; 182; 184 n. 1; 191 *seqq.* and notes
— attitude of SS. Paul and James to, 93 n. 36; 182; 196 n. 1; 222; 226
— party of, 84 nn. 4 and 6; 155 n. 11; 194; 219; 226
Claudius, Emperor, 54 n. 20; 167; 172 n. 6; 173 nn. 10 and 15; 187 nn. 8 and 10; 211 n. 25; 255; 257 nn. 15 and 16; 259 n. 22; 278 n. 36; 279 n. 37; 341 n. 25; 355 n. 24; 360 n. 2
Clemens, Flavius, Consul, 208 n. 9
Clement, 250 n. 16
Cleopatra, 206 n. 2; 271 n. 7
Codex Bezae, xiv; 172 n. 6; 234 n. 41; 282 n. 48; 305 n. 20
Cohors Italica, 153 n. 6
Collegia, 211 n. 25; 260 n. 23
Colossae, 296 n. 31; 306 n. 22
Comana, 296 n. 30
Common Meal, 4; 20 n. 34; 48 n. 1; 79; 85 n. 10; 155 n. 14; 162 n. 8; 182; 189 n. 18; 190 n. 22; 191 *seqq.*; 226; 235 n. 41; 286; 312; 323 nn. 14 *seqq.*; 372 *seqq.*
"Consolation," The, 92 n. 35
Corbulo, Cn. Domitius, 161 n. 5; 186 n. 8
Corinth, 34; 86 n. 12; 143; 260 n. 24; 264 *seqq.*; 272 n. 11; 273 n. 13; 276 nn. 26 *seqq.*; 288; 292 nn. 13 *seqq.*; 299; 301 n. 1; 305 n. 17; 307 *seqq.*; 343 *seqq.*
Cornelius, 49 n. 6; 150 *seqq.* and notes; 163 n. 11; 225; 233 nn. 37 and 38
Corycus, 185 n. 3
Cos, 277 n. 28; 302 n. 8
Crete, 32; 115 n. 16
Crispus, 208 n. 10; 266; 279 nn. 39 and 40
Crucifixion, The, 1; 12 n. 3; 14 n. 18; 30; 52 n. 14; 98; 116 n. 22; 132; 174 n. 15; 221; 230 n. 19
Cumanus, 15 n. 20; 51 n. 12; 52 n. 16; 53 n. 17; 186 n. 8; 287; 357; 360 n. 2
Cypriot Jews, 23 n. 48; 27 n. 59; 59 n. 45; 125 n. 68; 156; 350
Cyprus, 199 *seqq.*; 206 nn. 2 *seqq.*; 218; 240
Cyrene, 23 n. 48; 27 n. 59; 59 n. 45; 125 n. 68; 156; 295 n. 27

Damascus, 20 n. 39; 42; 45; 53 n. 20; 59 nn. 46 and 47; 94; 102; 121 n. 45
David, Tabernacle of, 234 n. 40
Death-penalty, The, 2; 41; 52 n. 14; 93 n. 36; 104; 175 n. 18
Delos, 277 n. 28
Demetrius, 332; 340 n. 19
Derbe, 185 n. 3; 204; 213 n. 32; 214 nn. 32 and 35; 241; 247 n. 7
διέρχομαι, meaning of, 216
Dispersion, Jews of, 9; 23 nn. 49 *seqq.*; 39; 48 nn. 2 and 3; 101; 104; 120 n. 37; 125 n. 67; 126; 161 n. 6; 191 n. 23; 213 nn. 30 and 31; 297; 358; 362 n. 9
Domitilla, 208 n. 9
Dora, 82 n. 3
Dorylaeum, 237; 248 n. 10
Druid Worship, 211 n. 25
Drusilla, 24 n. 50; 185 n. 3; 357; 361 n. 4
Dyrrhachium, 282 n. 44

Easter, 316; 327 n. 33; 357 n. 25
Ebionites, 89 n. 25; 190 n. 20
Ecstasy, 4; 5; 33 *seqq.*; 310
Eden, Garden of, 115 n. 14; 116 n. 20
Egypt, 25 n. 55; 43; 55 n. 27
Elders, *see* Presbyters
Eleazar, Pharisee of Galilee, 27 n. 58
— son of Ananias, 22 n. 45; 65
— son of Annas, 61
— son of Deinaeus, 360 n. 2
— son of Simon, 177 n. 33
"Elements," 113 n. 13
Eleusinian Mysteries, 275 n. 16
Elijah, 105 n. 1; 353 n. 17
Elionaios, son of Cantheras, 61
Elymas, 200; 208 n. 9; 308
Epaenetus, 355 n. 24
Epaphroditus, 250 n. 16
Ephesus, 200; 209 n. 13; 243; 247 nn. 7 *seqq.*; 269; 282 n. 46; 289; 296 *seqq.* and notes; 329; 331 *seqq.*; 340 nn. 18 and 22 *seqq.*; 349; 354 n. 24; 357 n. 25
Ephraim, village in Judaea, 59 n. 45
Ephron the Hittite, 55 n. 28
Epimenides, 115 n. 16
Erastus, 340 nn. 18 and 22
Esau, 109 n. 9; 131; 353 n. 17
Eschatology, 9; 16 n. 24; 24 nn. 51 *seqq.*; 41; 50 n. 10; 85 n. 10; 108 n. 9; 128; 130; 166; 172 n. 6; 187 n. 9; 262; 271 n. 7; 282 n. 43; 285; 315; 317; 325 n. 30; 327 n. 37; 349; 353 n. 20
Essenes, 18 n. 25; 19 n. 28; 36; 48 n. 1; 87 n. 17; 89 n. 23; 375
Ethnarch, 53 n. 20; 102; (of Alexandria) 186 n. 8 (alabarch); 258 n. 20
Eucharist, 4; 79; 85 nn. 10 and 11; 148; 193; 216 n. 38; 251 n. 21; 286; 292 n. 10; 312; 317; 323 nn. 14 and 15; 342 n. 31; 372 *seqq.* *See also* Common Meal

Eunuchs, 82 n. 2
Euodias, 250 n. 16
ἐξαποστέλλω, 124 n. 63; 164 n. 16; 274 n. 14; 363
Exorcism, 67; 72 n. 8; 208 n. 9; 309

Fadus, Cuspius, 60 n. 54; 176 n. 27; 179; 180; 186 nn. 6 *seqq.*
Faith, 117 n. 25; 119 n. 31; 141; 230 n. 16
Famine, (under Claudius) 63; 172 nn. 5 and 6; 180; 184 n. 2; 187 nn. 8 *seqq.*; 197 n. 8
Fasts, 193; 197 n. 8
Felix, 61 *seqq.*; 105 n. 2; 161 n. 5; 212 n. 26; 303 n. 14; 357; 361 n. 2
Flaccus, A. Avilius, prefect of Egypt, 161 n. 5; 211 n. 25
— G. Norbanus, 303 n. 11
— L. Valerius, 302 n. 8
Florus, Gessius, 52 n. 16
Fulvia, 259 n. 21

Gaius of Corinth, 279 n. 39
— of Macedonia, 289; 332
Galatia, Galatian Churches, etc., 177 n. 30; 207 n. 4; 212 n. 29; 215 n. 38; 218; 227 nn. 3 and 5; 235 n. 41; 236 *seqq.*; 239 *seqq.*; 289; 296 n. 30; 301 n. 1; 324 n. 22; 326 n. 31; 342 n. 28
Galilee, Galileans, etc., 7; 8; 20 n. 39; 21 n. 45; 22 n. 46; 42; 45; 57 n. 43; 66; 71 n. 4; 77; 78; 80 *seqq.*; 85 n. 10; 89 nn. 29 *seqq.*; 123 n. 58; 190 n. 21; 360 n. 2
Gallio, 197 n. 8; 212 n. 26; 267 *seqq.*; 278 nn. 36 *seqq.*
Gamala, 42; 53 n. 18
Gamaliel, 2; 13 n. 8; 72 n. 8; 94; 106 n. 4
Gentile attitude to Judaism, 66; 82 n. 3; 150; 153 n. 6; 200; 208 n. 9; 214 n. 37; 245; 253; 257 nn. 12 *seqq.*; 263; 265; 272 n. 11; 275 n. 19; 276 n. 27; 341 n. 25
— collections for Church of Jerusalem, 166; 173 n. 8; 183; 190 n. 20; 284 *seqq.*; 317; 330 *seqq.*; 349; 357 n. 25
— conception of Christianity, 148; 285; 292 nn. 10 *seqq.*; 311 *seqq.*; 324 n. 25
— converts, controversy as to, 150 *seqq.*; 156 *seqq.*; 181 *seqq.*; 189 nn. 17 *seqq.*; 191 *seqq.*; 219 *seqq.*; 284
— magistrates, attitude of, to Jews and Christians, 202; 212 n. 28; 213 n. 31; 245; 251 nn. 22 *seqq.*; 255; 258 nn. 20 *seqq.*; 261; 267; 278 n. 37; 302 nn. 8 *seqq.*; 332
— magistrates, attitude of Christians to, 255; 260 n. 25; 349; 353 n. 20
Gentiles, attitude of Jews to, 9 *seqq.*; 23 n. 49; 24 nn. 51 and 53; 26 nn. 57 *seqq.*; 56 n. 37; 82 n. 3; 109 n. 9; 120 n. 37; 129; 156; 161 n. 4; 200; 201; 203; 228 n. 5; 235 n. 41; 253; 347; 351 n. 10
Gentiles, S. Paul on, 96 *seqq.*; 113 n. 13; 123 nn. 55 *seqq.*; 136; 146; 202; 210 n. 24; 264; 275 n. 19; 291 n. 5; 305 n. 20; 346 *seqq.*; 351 nn. 10 *seqq.*
Gerasa, 154
Gerizim, Mount, 41; 66; 70 n. 4; 74 n. 12; 75 n. 18
Glabrio, M. Acilius, 208 n. 9
Gnosticism, 138
Golden Calf, the, 44; 55 n. 33
Gratus (Valerius), 61
Greek Games, 250 n. 16
Greek language, the, 33; 48 n. 2; 277 n. 34

Hadrian, 27 n. 58
Hagar, 115 n. 14; 222; 230 n. 22
Halicarnassus, 302 n. 7
Hamor, 55 n. 28
Hasmonean dynasty, the, 57 n. 43
"Heavenly Man," the, 99; 134; 138
Hebrew Christianity, character of, 1 *seqq.*; 31; 39; 87 n. 17; 147; 165; 171; 180; 190 n. 20; 285 *seqq.*; 313; 338 n. 8; 359; 382 *seqq.*
— Christians, 39; 45; 48 n. 2; 57 n. 42; 68; 70; 73 n. 12; 75 nn. 15 and 18; 76; 84 n. 6; 89 n. 30; 103; 152; 155 n. 14; 158; 178 n. 35; 191 n. 23; 219 *seqq.*; 257 n. 15; 283 n. 49; 291 nn. 5 and 9; 311; 320 nn. 10 *seqq.*; 337 n. 5; 382 *seqq.*
"Hebrew," S. Paul's claim to the title, 94; 105 n. 3; 337 n. 5
Hebrews, 9; 26 n. 57; 39; 48 n. 3; 126; 161 n. 6; 277 n. 34
Hebron, 55 n. 28
Helena of Adiabene, 49 n. 4; 180; 187 nn. 10 and 11
Hellenist Christians, 10; 22 nn. 48 *seqq.*; 39; 45; 48 nn. 1 *seqq.*; 56 n. 42; 59 n. 45; 66; 76; 83 nn. 4 *seqq.*; 89 n. 30; 125 n. 68; 155 n. 11; 156; 158; 163 nn. 13 and 14; 189 n. 14; 199; 206 n. 3; 254; 258 n. 16; 260 n. 24; 350; 357 n. 27
— Jews. *See* Dispersion, Jews of
— synagogues in Jerusalem, 23 n. 48; 40; 76; 84 n. 7; 103; 122 n. 51; 181; 253; 256 n. 4; 287; 301
Hellenistic Judaism, 9; 24 nn. 52 *seqq.*; 96 *seqq.*; 126 *seqq.*; (at the Syrian Antioch) 156; 299; 304 n. 17; 320 n. 10
Hellenistic Theology, 126; 136 *seqq.*; 376; 379
Hemerobaptists, 304 n. 16
Herennius Capito, 361 n. 2
Herod Agrippa I, 57 n. 42; 60 n. 54; 61; 71 n. 4; 87 n. 20; 93 n. 36; 153 n. 6; 167 *seqq.*; 179; 185 n. 3; 188 n. 14; 283 n. 49; 361 n. 2
— II, 60 n. 54; 61; 212 n. 26; 361 n. 2
— Antipas, 15 n. 18; 42; 53 n. 18; 54 n. 20; 57 n. 43; 58 n. 44; 59 n. 47; 154 n. 6

Herod, of Chalcis, 61; 179; 186 n. 8; 357
— the Great, 14 n. 11; 24 n. 51; 57 n. 43; 58 n. 44; 61; 66; 71 n. 4; 82 n. 3; 173 n. 10
Herodian household in Rome, 257 n. 10; 356 n. 24
Herodians, 22 n. 47; 58 n. 44
Herodias, 42
Herodion, 355 n. 4
Hierapolis, 296 n. 31; 306 n. 22; 370
High Priesthood, the, 61 *seqq.*
High Priest, Robes of the, 47; 52 n. 16; 60 n. 54; 61
Hillel, 26 n. 57; 92 n. 35; 94; 105 n. 4
Hymenaeus, 325 n. 30
Hyrcanus, John, 26 n. 57; 71 n. 4
— II, 62

Iconium, 203 *seqq.*; 212 nn. 29 *seqq.*; 239; 243
Idolatry, 56 n. 37; 83 n. 3; 96; 113 n. 13; 129; 146; 226; 234 n. 41; 253; 259 n. 21; 264; 275 nn. 19 and 20; 315; 325 n. 29; 326 n. 31; 347; 374
Illyricum, 281 n. 42; 282 n. 44; 342 n. 32
Immortality, 10; 28 n. 63; 128; 137; 142; 325 n. 30
Ishmael, son of Phiabi, 61
— the younger, 62
Ishmaelites, 222
Isis, cult of, 143; 211 n. 25; 276 n. 27; 378
Izates, 26 n. 58; 180

Jacob, 43; 55 nn. 27 and 28; 109 n. 9; 131; 353 n. 17
James, S., son of Zebedee, xv; 87 n. 20; 169; 174 n. 15; 175 n. 19; 176 n. 23; 371
— the Lord's Brother, 20 n. 41; 80 *seqq.*; 89 n. 29; 91 nn. 35 *seqq.*; 103; 121 n. 46; 124 n. 61; 139; 169 *seqq.*; 175 nn. 21 *seqq.*; 181 *seqq.*; 191; 196 n. 1; 220; 224; (at Council of Jerusalem) 226, 231 n. 32 and 233 nn. 39 *seqq.*; 360; 362 n. 17; 363 *seqq.*
Jamnia, 82 n. 3; 178 n. 33; 361 n. 2
Jason, 272 nn. 9 *seqq.*; 295 n. 27
Jerusalem, 7; 12 n. 2; 15 n. 21; 21 n. 45; 22 n. 46; 32; 42; 47; 52 n. 16; 53 n. 17; 54 n. 22; 66 *seqq.*; 75; 77; 167; 173 n. 15; 174 n. 17; 180; 269; 283 n. 49; 302 nn. 8 *seqq.*; 354 n. 23
— Capture of (63 B.C.), 24 n. 51; 57 n. 43; 252; 256 n. 4
— Church of, 1 *seqq.*; 44 *seqq.*; (attitude to Samaritans) 67 and 73 n. 12; 78 *seqq.*; (to Cornelius) 151 *seqq.*; (to Antioch) 157 *seqq.*; (persecuted by Herod Agrippa I) 167 *seqq.*; (presbyters in) 170 *seqq.*; (during famine) 180, 187 nn. 10 and 11; (mission to Antioch) 191 *seqq.*; 199; 205; 206 n. 4; 209 n. 11 (attitude to SS. Paul and Silas) 241, 246 n. 5 and 274 n. 13; (to collection of the Gentiles) 284 *seqq.*, 345, 362 nn. 12 and 17; 375
Jerusalem, Communism at, 4; 19 n. 28; 48 n. 1; 79
— Council of, 20 n. 41; 121 n. 41; 188 n. 14; 207 n. 4; 219 *seqq.*; 246 nn. 1 and 4; 311; 316; 326 n. 31
— Hellenists in, 22 n. 48; 23 n. 50; 39 *seqq.*; 76; 84 n. 7
— Police of, 15 n. 19; 58 nn. 44 and 45; 176 n. 27
— S. Paul at, 44 *seqq.*; 102 *seqq.*; 181 *seqq.*; 220 *seqq.*; 240; 284 *seqq.*; 294 n. 23; 301; 306 n. 21; 331; 349; 357 *seqq.*
— The Heavenly, 17 n. 24; 110 n. 9; 222; 230 n. 22
— The Jewish Rebellion and, 22 n. 45; 26 n. 58; 110 n. 9; 177 n. 33; 325 n. 26; 357; 361 n. 4
Jesus, Christ, Our Lord etc., 1; 7; 44; 78; 80; 81; 89 nn. 29 and 30; 165; 170; 174 n. 15; 177 n. 33; 211 n. 24; 215 n. 38; 284 *seqq.*; 293 n. 14; 363; 366
— and Samaria, 68; 73 n. 12
— as Messiah, 3; 11; 30; 50 n. 10; 67; 72 n. 8; 75 n. 16; 98; 116 n. 20; 130; 139; 299; 304 n. 16
— attitude of Sanhedrin to, 1; 2; 12 n. 3; 13 n. 10; 14 nn. 15 *seqq.*; 20 n. 41; 43; 51 n. 12; 56 n. 40
— attitude to the Law, 7; 16 n. 23; 21 n. 42
— family circle of, 80 *seqq.*; 90 n. 35; 93 n. 41
— Last Supper of. *See* Eucharist
— relations of, to contemporary teaching, 1; 8; 11; 12 n. 7; 16 n. 24; 18 n. 25; 21 n. 41; 22 n. 46; 80 *seqq.*; 88 n. 25; 172 n. 4
— S. Paul and, 16 n. 23; 30; 46; 60 n. 48; 98 *seqq.*; 116 nn. 20 *seqq.*; 119 nn. 31 and 33; 122 n. 54; 130; 133 *seqq.*; 141; 145 *seqq.*; 189 n. 16; 190 n. 20; 201; 210 nn. 18 and 19; (in Galatians) 221, 229 n. 13, 230 nn. 16 and 19 and 231 nn. 23 and 24; 261; 264; 271 n. 7; 284; 291 n. 6; 294 n. 20; 317; 318 n. 3; 327 n. 37; 343 nn. 38 and 41; 346 *seqq.*; 365
— "Spirit of," 243; 248 n. 11
— titles of, in *Codex Bezae*, xvii
Jews. *See* Dispersion, Hebrews, Hellenists etc.
Jochanan b. Zacchai, R., 112 n. 12
John, S., xv; 6; 15 n. 19; 20 n. 33; 68; 81; 88 n. 20; 181; 307; 371
— the Baptist, S., xvi; 15 n. 18; 18 n. 25 54 n. 21; 72 n. 8; 299; 300; 304 n. 16; 307
— of Gischala, 22 n. 45
— the Essene, 177 n. 33
John Mark, 19 n. 28; 184; 191 n. 25 199; 200; 209 n. 11; 240

Joiada, 70 n. 4
Jonathan, High Priest, 47; 54 n. 22; 61; 65; 357; 360 n. 2
Joppa, 82 n. 3; 150; 153 n. 3; 154 n. 9
Joseph, 43; 55 nn. 27 and 28
— Barsabbas, 89 n. 30; 236 n. 42
— of Arimathea, 20 n. 41
— son of Cami, 61
— — Ellen, 63
— — Gorion, 177 n. 33
Judaea, evangelization of, 7; 12 n. 2; 20 n. 38; 59 n. 45; 66; 76 *seqq.*; 85 nn. 9 *seqq.*; 150; 153 n. 6; 154 n. 8; 174 n. 15; 216 n. 38; 369
— persecutions in, 58 n. 44; 84 n. 7; 175 n. 18; 229 n. 6; 291 n. 5; 292 n. 10. *See also* Herod Agrippa I
— relations with the Roman Empire, 15 n. 20; 22 n. 45; 24 n. 51; 42; 45; 58 n. 44; 60 nn. 54 and 57; 61 *seqq.*; 165 *seqq.*; 172 nn. 2 and 6; 179; 252; 256 n. 4; 303 n. 11
— procurators of, 71 n. 4; 123 n. 60; 153 n. 6; 161 n. 5; 176 n. 27; 187 n. 8; 212 n. 28
— unrest in, 3; 12 n. 6; 13 n. 10; 14 n. 18; 22 n. 45; 41; 52 n. 16; 53 n. 17; 59 n. 45; 78; 79; 88 n. 21; 89 n. 27; 105 n. 4; 120 n. 37; 187 n. 8; 294 n. 23; 306 n. 21; 331; 357 *seqq.*
Judaism, adherents of, 27 n. 58; 76; 82 nn. 2 and 3; 151; 156; 161 n. 4; 200 *seqq.*; 207 n. 7; 208 n. 9; 220; 244; 253; 257 n. 9; 261; 263; 265; 270 n. 4; 275 n. 16; 276 n. 27; 284; 349; 354 n. 22; 358
— Christianity as the true version of, 43; 51 n. 10; 101; 120 n. 36; 202; 212 n. 26; 266; 277 n. 34; 285; 290 n. 4; 298
— popular standard of, 8; 22 nn. 46 and 47; 93 nn. 36 and 37; 122 n. 54; 123 n. 57; 182; 192; 196 n. 1; 197 n. 5; 219; 222; 225; 231 n. 23; 233 n. 35; 292 n. 10
— rabbinical developments of, 7; 8; 21 n. 41; 22 nn. 46 and 47; 23 n. 50; 35; 51 n. 12; 55 nn. 28 and 33; 56 nn. 40 and 41; 71 n. 7; 81; 83 n. 3; 84 n. 7; 92 n. 35; 106 n. 8; 110 n. 10; 116 nn. 20 and 22; 154 n. 10; 175 n. 18; 177 n. 33; 206 n. 1; 275 n. 15; 283 n. 49; 322 n. 13; 326 n. 31; 353 n. 17
Judas Barsabbas, 89 n. 30; 227; 236 n. 42; 246 n. 5; 324 n. 22
— of Galilee, 12 n. 6; 13 n. 10; 22 n. 45; 106 n. 4; 187 n. 8
Jude, S., 89 n. 29
Junias, 260 n. 24; 355 n. 24; 364; 369

Kenaz, 35

Lanuvium, 211 n. 25
Laodicea, 302 n. 7; 306 n. 22
Laranda, 185 n. 3; 212 n. 29
Latin language, the, 33; 339 n. 15
Law, the, allegorical interpretation of, 9; 24 nn. 53 *seqq.*; 96 *seqq.*; 126 *seqq.*; 299; 304 n. 17
— an obstacle to Jewish propaganda, 10; 25 n. 53; 27 n. 61; 28 n. 65; 40; 100; 150; 153 n. 4; 157
— as a safeguard against sin, 9; 11; 94; 103; 106 nn. 5 and 8; 109 n. 9; 157; 162 n. 10; 195; 202; 253; 347
— impossibility of observing, 98; 109 n. 9; 111 n. 10; 181; 201; 210 n. 20; 348
— and the Messianic Kingdom, 7; 12 n. 6; 24 n. 52; 25 n. 56; 27 n. 62; 41; 50 n. 10; 94; 95
— perfection of, 8; 20 n. 41; 35; 41; 93 n. 37; 95; 109 n. 9
Levi, 71 n. 4
— tribe of, 91 n. 35
Levites, 50 n. 8; 58 n. 45
Libertines, synagogue of the, 23 n. 48; 253; 256 n. 4
Longinus, C. Cassius, 60 n. 54; 179
Lucius of Cyrene, 125 n. 68; 295 n. 17
Luke, S., ix; 214 n. 37; 243; 245; 248 n. 13; 252 n. 27; 342
— methods of writing, x; 13 n. 9; 74 n. 12; 88 n. 20; 163 n. 15; 176 n. 30; 184 n. 2; 187 n. 10; 188 n. 14; 197 n. 8; 206 n. 1; 209 n. 12; 210 nn. 18 and 24; 234 n. 40; 246 n. 5; 259 n. 23; 273 n. 13; 290 n. 2; 295 n. 27; 307; 340 n. 22; 342 n. 32; 363 *seqq.*
Lycaonian dialect, 213 n. 32
Lydda, 83 n. 3; 85 n. 8
Lydia, 244; 250 n. 21
Lystra, 203; 209 n. 11; 212 nn. 29 *seqq.*; 236; 239; 241

Macedonia, 244 *seqq.*; 261 *seqq.*; 289; 296 n. 29; 318; 329; 331; 333; 340 nn. 18 and 22; 342 n. 28
Manaen, 27 n. 59; 172 n. 7
Mandean Religion, 144; 304 n. 16
Marcellus, procurator of Judaea, 60 n. 57
Marcion, 54 n. 24; 356 n. 24
Marsus, C. Vibius, 186 n. 4
Mary, sister of S. Barnabas, 19 n. 28; 169; 175 n. 20
— Roman convert, 355 n. 24
Maryllus, procurator of Judaea, 60 n. 57; 104; 123 n. 60
Mastema, 112 n. 12
Matthias, S., 6; 364
— son of Annas, High Priest, 61
Meats, distinction of, 25 n. 53; 127; 150; 226; 234 n. 41; 354 n. 22
— offered to idols, 226; 234 n. 41; 315; 326 n. 31; 354 n. 22
Mesopotamia, 54 n. 25
Messiah, claimants to title of, 5; 13 n. 10; 20 n. 30; 41; 52 n. 15; (Simon Magus) 67 and 72 n. 8; 78; 175 n. 18; 187 n. 8; 304 n. 16; 357; 361 n. 7

Messianic beliefs of Judaism, 1; 9 *seqq.*; 12 n. 6; 17 n. 24; 24 nn. 51 and 52; 25 n. 56; 26 n. 57; 27 n. 62; 28 n. 63; 30 *seqq.*; 50 n. 10; 56 n. 37; 72 n. 8; 90 n. 35; (in S. Paul) 98; 111 n. 11; 116 nn. 20 *seqq.*; 128 and 138 *seqq.*; 210 n. 18; 221; 230 n. 19; 282 n. 43; 299; 304 n. 16; 326 n. 30
Metilius, 26 n. 58
Miletus, 302 n. 7; 341 n. 28; 342 n. 31; 349
Miracles, 4; 19 n. 30; 40; 67; 72 n. 8; 150; 204; 225; 233 n. 38; 252 n. 26; 286; 292 n. 12; 300; 305 n. 20; 308; 366
Mithras, cult of, 275 n. 16; 376; 378
Mithridates, 302 n. 8
Mnason, 206 n. 3; 350
Moesia, 161 n. 5
Moloch, 211 n. 25
Montanism, 35; 216 n. 38
Moses, 17 n. 24; 43; 55 nn. 29 *seqq.*; 171; 177 n. 33; 221; 230 n. 19; 234 n. 40
Mummius, 276 n. 26
Mystery-cults, xi; 120 n. 35; 139 *seqq.*; 211 n. 25; 275 n. 16; 276 n. 27; 376 *seqq.*

Nabatea, *see* Arabia
Nazianzos, 296 n. 30
Nazirite vow, 168; 173 n. 15; 269; 283 n. 49; 289 n. 1; 360
Neapolis, 244
Nero, 23 n. 50; 211 n. 25; 362 n. 17
Nicaea, 237; 248 n. 10
Nicodemus, 20 n. 41
Nicolaitan heresy, 293 n. 17
Nicolas, 49 n. 6; 293 n. 17
Nicomedia, 237; 248 n. 10
Niger of Peraea, 177 n. 33

Olba, 185 n. 3
Olive, synagogue of the, 254; 258 nn. 17 and 20
Onesiphorus, 213 n. 30
Onias, 62
Original sin, 95; 106 n. 8; 108 n. 9
Osiris, 378
Ostorius Scapula, 278 n. 36

Palestine, *see* Judaea, Jerusalem etc.
Pallas, 63; 357; 361 n. 2
Panticapaeum, 248 n. 10
Paphos, 200; 208 n. 11; 218
Paradise, 17 n. 24; 116 n. 20
Parthia, 42; 53 n. 18
Passover, the, 2; 47; 53 n. 17; 61; 87 n. 20; 89 n. 28; 167; 174 n. 15; 175 n. 19; 269; 283 n. 49; 349; 357 n. 25; 358, 382
Patrae, 282 n. 44
Patriarchs, 43; 55 nn. 26 and 28
Paul, S. (authenticity of Epistles) ix; (dates in career) xiii; (attitude to earlier Christianity) 16 n. 23 and 30; (at death of S. Stephen) 44; (journey to Damascus) 46; (conversion) *ib.*; (education as a Pharisee) 94; (as a Hellenist) 96; (his view of Christianity) 98; (knowledge of Hellenistic theology) 99; (attitude to Gentiles) 100; (character) 101; (returns to Jerusalem) 102; (withdraws to Tarsus) 104; (at Antioch) 159; (in Syria and Cilicia) 179; (visits Jerusalem) 180; (attitude to Titus) 182; (protests against S. Peter at Antioch) 192; (in Cyprus) 199; (in Galatia) 201; (returns to Antioch) 205; (writes to Galatians) 220; (at Council of Jerusalem) 223; (quarrels with S. Barnabas) 240; (revisits Galatia with Silas) 241; (unable to enter Asia) 243; (enters Macedonia) 244; (at Thessalonica) 261; (at Athens) 263; (at Corinth) 264; (before Gallio) 267; (returns to Jerusalem) 269; (prepares for collection) 284; (at Ephesus) 289; (difficulties with Corinthian Church) 311 *seqq.*; (at Corinth) 345; (writes to Romans) 346; (returns to Jerusalem) 357; (his claim to Apostolate) 363; (his teaching on the Eucharist) 372
Pentecost, 5; 20 n. 31; 32; 53 n. 17; 61; 283 n. 49; 318; 327 n. 33; 341 n. 22; 349; 358
Perga, 200; 205; 208 n. 11; 209 n. 15; 218
Pergamum, 296 n. 30; 302 n. 8
Peter, S. (in primitive community) 6; (at Samaria) 68; (relations to growth of Church in Palestine) 79; (entertains S. Paul) 103; (at Joppa) 150; (at Caesarea) 151; (at Jerusalem) *ib.*; (escapes from Herod) 169; (at Jerusalem during famine) 181; (at Antioch) 191; (at Council of Jerusalem) 225; (supposed and actual visits to Rome) 257 n. 15; (departure from Judaea) 289; (appealed to at Corinth) 314
— attitude of, to Judaism, 16 n. 23; 123 n. 58; 150; 163 n. 11; 191 n. 22; 192; 197 n. 5; 220; 225
— theology of, 16 n. 23; 28 n. 62; 31; 225; 233 n. 37
Petronius, P., 61; 120 n. 37; 161 n. 5; 165; 172 n. 2; 173 n. 12
Pharisees, 1; 2; 12 n. 6; 13 n. 8; 14 nn. 12 and 13; 15 n. 19; 22 n. 46; 27 n. 58; 35; 40; 44; 50 n. 8; 51 nn. 11 and 12; 58 n. 44; 90 n. 35; 92 n. 36; 93 n. 41; 94 *seqq.*; 102; 106 nn. 4 *seqq.*; 122 n. 54; 124 n. 61; 168; 174 n. 18; 197 n. 5; 225; 233 n. 37; 331; 359; 362 n. 13
— converted to Christianity, 2; 7; 8; 12 n. 3; 13 n. 8; 20 n. 41; 80; 93 n. 39; 224 *seqq.*; 232 nn. 35 *seqq.*
Philetus, 325 n. 30
Philip, S., x; 20 n. 37; 49 n. 6; 56 n. 42; 66 *seqq.*; 75; 76; 82 nn. 1 *seqq.*; 86 n. 13; 323 n. 16; 324 n. 22; 350; 357 n. 27; 370

Philippi, 89 n. 24; 244; 249 nn. 16 *seqq.*; 261; 263; 265; 270 n. 5; 274 n. 13; 342 nn. 28 and 31; 349
Phoebe, 189 n. 15
Phoenicia, 74 n. 12; 161 n. 4; 187 n. 5; 223; 231 n. 30
"Phrygian and Galatian region," 177 n. 30; 236 *seqq.*
Piso, Cn. Calpurnius, 275 n. 15
Polemon of Cilicia, 179; 185 n. 3
Politarchs, 262; 272 nn. 9 *seqq.*
Pomponia Graecina, 211 n. 25
Pontius Pilate, 2; 14 nn. 16 and 18; 41; 42; 47; 52 nn. 14 and 15; 53 n. 17; 61; 120 n. 37; 373
Predestination, 107 n. 8; 119 n. 31
Presbyters, in (Palestine), 78; 86 n. 17; (at Jerusalem) 170; 176 n. 30; 177 nn. 31 and 33; 180; 189 n. 14; 205; 212 n. 29; 215 n. 38; 224; 231 n. 32; 252 n. 27; 268; 280 n. 41; 349; 360; 362 n. 12
Prophecy, 34 *seqq.*; 165; 172 nn. 4 and 6; 180; 187 n. 9; 286; 292 n. 12
Proselytes, 26 n. 58; 27 n. 59; 39; 49 nn. 4 and 5; 83 n. 3; 120 n. 37; 150; 152; 153 n. 4; 155 n. 13; 157; 159; 187 n. 11; 195; 200; 202; 219; 225; 229 n. 9; 235 n. 41; 244; 249 n. 13; 253; 257 n. 9; 259 n. 21; 280 n. 41; 302 n. 8; 354 n. 22

Quadratus, C. Ummidius, 53 n. 17; 357; 360 n. 2
Quirinius, *see* Census

Ramiel, 112 n. 12
Resurrection of Our Lord, 3 *seqq.*; 10; 16 n. 23; 20 nn. 39 and 40; 78; 80; 86 n. 16; 90 n. 34; 146; 170; 177 n. 31; 178 n. 33; 201; 210 n. 19; 264; 284; 291 n. 6; 311; 313; 317; 327 nn. 36 and 37; 343 n. 41; 365 *seqq.*
— of the dead, 128; 142; 146; 282 n. 43; 315; 317; 325 n. 30; 327 n. 37
"Righteous Servant," the, 3; 16 n. 23; 28 n. 62; 30; 292 n. 10
Righteousness, S. Paul's conception of, 98; 100; 108 n. 9; 119 n. 31; 123 n. 57; 146; 181; 201; 221 *seqq.*; 230 n. 19; 293 n. 14; 343 n. 41; 347; 352 n. 14
Roman Citizenship of S. Paul, 94; 105 n. 2; 179; 185 n. 4; 212 n. 28; 213 n. 31; 240; 245; 246 n. 3; 322 n. 12
Roman Empire, Government etc., 15 n. 20; 42; 47; 52 n. 15; 53 nn. 17 and 20; 58 n. 44; 59 n. 47; 61 *seqq.*; 161 n. 5; 165; 168; 179; 202; 206 n. 2; 211 n. 25; 251 n. 24; 252; 255; 256 n. 9; 259 nn. 21 and 23; 267; 276 n. 27; 297; 302 nn. 8 *seqq.*; 333; 341 nn. 26 and 27; 349; 353 n. 20; 358
Rome, 23 nn. 48 and 50; 53 n. 17; 167; 176 n. 29; 251 n. 24; 252 *seqq.*; 261; 264; 267; 271 n. 6; 273 n. 11; 279 n. 37; 280 n. 41; 304 n. 16; 331; 339 n. 14; 344 *seqq.*

Sadducees, 1; 13 nn. 8 and 11; 14 nn. 13 *seqq.*; 40 *seqq.*; 50 n. 8; 51 n. 12; 64; 89 n. 24; 167; 168; 174 n. 18; 186 n. 6; 287; 301; 359; 362 n. 9
Salamis, 199; 207 n. 6
Samaria, 13 n. 10; 15 n. 20; 41; 52 nn. 14 and 15; 57 n. 43; 66 *seqq.*; 75; 86 n. 13; 87 n. 20; 152; 153 n. 6; 163 n. 11; 167; 170; 173 n. 10; 176 n. 27; 199; 223; 231 n. 30; 274 n. 15; 324 n. 22; 360 n. 2
Samaritan Pentateuch, 71 n. 5
Sanhedrin, 2; 12 nn. 3 and 6; 13 nn. 10 and 11; 14 nn. 12 and 18 *seqq.*; 20 n. 41; 40 *seqq.*; 51 n. 11; 58 nn. 44 and 45; 59 n. 47; 60 n. 54; 82; 104; 124 n. 60; 171; 175 n. 18; 176 n. 27; 177 n. 33; 178 nn. 34 and 35; 206 n. 1; 359; 362 n. 13; 371
Sarah, 115 n. 14; 131
Sardinia, 256 n. 9
Sardis, 247 n. 9; 276 n. 27; 296 n. 30; 302 n. 7; 303 n. 11
Satan, 112 n. 12; 114 n. 14; 130; 272 n. 11
Saul, *see* Paul, S.
Sceva, 208 n. 9; 307
Scythopolis, 154 n. 6
Sebaste, 66; 71 n. 4; 74 n. 12
Sejanus, 259 nn. 21 and 22
Seleuceia in Cilicia, 185 n. 3
— port of Antioch, 125 n. 68; 199
Sergius Paulus, 200; 208 nn. 9 and 10
"Seven," the, (in Jerusalem) 39; 49 nn. 5 and 6; 189 n. 14; 370
Shammai, 105 n. 4
Shechem, 71 n. 4
Sicarii, 13 n. 10; 65; 175 n. 18; 362 n. 15
Silas, 89 n. 30; 227; 236 n. 42; 240; 245; 246 n. 5; 262; 265; 273 n. 13; 276 n. 25; 289; 295 n. 27; 296 n. 30; 314; 324 n. 22; 364
— of Babylon, 177 n. 33
Simeon b. Gamaliel, R., 72 n. 7
Simon Magus, 67; 68; 72 nn. 8 *seqq.*; 75 n. 17
— Cantheras, 61; 168
— Maccabaeus, 82 n. 3
— son of Camithus, 61
— son of Gioras, 22 n. 45
Sinai, Mount, 115 n. 14; 222
Smyrna, 247 n. 9; 296 n. 30
Solomon's Porch, 6; 16 n. 22
"Son of Man," 30; 31
"Son of the Star," 72 n. 8
Sopater, 295 n. 27
Sorcery, 200; 208 n. 9; 309
Sosthenes, 279 nn. 38 and 40; 364
"Speaking with tongues," 5; 32 *seqq.*; 205; 216 n. 38; 286; 292 n. 10; 310; 319 n. 6; 323 n. 15; 375; 383

Stephanas, 260 n. 24; 282 n. 44
Stephen, S., 20 n. 37; 40; 42 *seqq.*; 48 n. 1; 49 nn. 6 and 7; 50 nn. 10 *seqq.*; 54 nn. 22 *seqq.*; 66; 69; 73 n. 10; 75 n. 19; 76; 86 n. 15; 94; 103; 124 n. 62; 156; 158; 160 n. 1; 161 n. 4; 350
Stoics, 25 n. 55; 127
Symmachians, 139
Synagogue, (language used in) 48 n. 2; (in Samaria) 69; 75 n. 18 and 274 n. 15; (exclusion from) 84 n. 7; (arrangement of worship in) 86 n. 17; 196 n. 4; 201; 210 n. 17 and 250 n. 17; (relation of Christians to) 79; 89 nn. 24 and 25; 160; 162 n. 8; 165 n. 21; 250 n. 21; (at Rome) 254; 256 nn. 4 and 6; 258 nn. 17 and 20 and 260 n. 23; (in Corinth) 266 and 277 n. 34; 358
— Rulers of, 86 n. 17; 210 n. 17; 216 n. 38; 268; 279 n. 40
Syria, 53 n. 17; 57 n. 43; 82 n. 3; 105 n. 2; 156; 161 n. 5; 170; 179; 184 n. 2; 185 n. 3; 186 n. 5; 191 n. 23; 197 n. 8; 199; 207 n. 4; 208 n. 11; 212 n. 29; 227 n. 3; 235 n. 41; 241; 243; 246 n. 5; 247 n. 7; 260 n. 24; 274 n. 13; 289 n. 1; 342 n. 32; 368
— Legates of, 42; 47; 52 nn. 16 *seqq.*; 60 n. 54; 61; 63; 161 n. 5; 165; 172 n. 2; 179; 186 n. 4; 357; 360 n. 2
Syrian Gates, the, 246 n. 1

Tabernacle, the, 55 nn. 33 and 35; 56 n. 36; "of David," 234 n. 40
Tarsus, 94; 104; 105 nn. 2 and 3; 124 nn. 63 *seqq.*; 160 n. 1; 184 n. 2; 185 n. 3; 236; 246 nn. 1 and 5; 247 n. 7; 296 n. 30; 367
Taurus, the, 303 n. 10
Temple, the, 2; 3; 6; 14 n. 15; 16 n. 22; 22 n. 46; 41 *seqq.*; 50 nn. 8 and 10; 51 n. 12; (of Solomon) 55 n. 35; 56 n. 37; 58 n. 45; 66 *seqq.*; 70 n. 4; 75 n. 18; 76; 104; 115 n. 14; 120 n. 37; 165 *seqq.*; 172 n. 6; 173 n. 11; 187 n. 9; 259 n. 21; 284; 290 n. 4; 292 n. 10; 297 *seqq.*; 301; 302 n. 8; 303 n. 13; 306 n. 21; 358; 360; 362 nn. 9 and 11; 374
Tertullus, 279 n. 38; 306 n. 21
Theatre, attitude of Jews to, 23 n. 50
Theophilus, High Priest, 61; 168; 174 n. 16
Therapeutae, 19 n. 28; 375
Thessalonica, 161 n. 5; 249 nn. 15 and 16; 250 n. 17; 257 n. 16; 261 *seqq.*; 277 n. 29; 315; 342 n. 28
Theudas, 15 n. 19
Tiberias, 185 n. 3
Tiberius, 42; 47; 53 n. 17; 54 n. 20; 172 n. 6; 173 n. 11; 211 n. 25; 255; 257 nn. 12 and 15; 355 n. 24
— Alexander, 23 n. 50; 180; 186 n. 8; 187 n. 10
Timothy, 24 n. 50; 213 n. 30; 214 n. 33; 242; 263; 265; 272 n. 11; 273 n. 13; 276 n. 25; 289; 318; 331; 340 n. 18; 342 n. 28; 364
Titius Justus, 266
Titus, 155 n. 13; 181 *seqq.*; 189 nn. 15, 17 and 19; 231 n. 27; 289; 330; 333; 338 n. 11; 340 n. 18; 343 n. 39; 364
"Tongues of Angels," 112 n. 12
Trajan, 207 n. 6
Troas, 243; 248 nn. 11 and 12; 249 n. 15; 333; 342 nn. 30, 31 and 32; 349; 357 n. 25; 372; 375; 385
Trophimus, 362 n. 11
Tryphaena, 213 n. 30
Tyana, 296 n. 30. *See also* Apollonius
Tyrannus, School of, 300; 305 n. 20

Vespasian, 161 n. 5; 208 n. 9
Via Egnatia, 251 n. 21; 271 n. 6; 273 n. 11
Vitellius, L., 42; 47; 52 n. 16; 53 n. 17; 54 nn. 20 and 22; 61; 161 n. 5; 165

Women at public worship, 312; 322 n. 13; 323 n. 16

Zeus Ammon, 276 n. 22
— Hellenios, 71 n. 4
Zion, Mount, 115 n. 14

13, b 20

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY W. LEWIS AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

2767

DATE DUE

BS
2505
.K6

13,620

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

WEISE BINDING CO.
JUL 1947
CINCINNATI, O.

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS2505.K6
Knox, Wilfred St. Paul and the Church of
3 0645 0005 6808 5